A STUDY OF SOCIALISM
IN THE CONTEMPORARY BRITISH NOVEL
(1940 -- 1949)

BY

CARL R. DOLMETSCH, A. B.

A THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts
in Drake University

Des Moines, Iowa
August, 1949

A STUDY OF SOCIALISM
IN THE CONTEMPORARY BRITISH NOVEL
(1940 -- 1949)

BY

CARL R. DOLMETSCH, A. B.

Approved By:

Thomas F. Dunn
Major Professor

William B. Bjornstad
Supporting Professor

H. E. Alley
Committee

Herbert W. Bohlman
Dean of Graduate Division

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

To Professor Thomas F. Dunn, in gratitude for his kindly guidance through four difficult years, to Professor William Bjornstad, for his patient assistance in composition, to Professor Theodore A. Stroud, whose friendly skepticism was stimulating to this work, and to my wife, Joan, who gave it the inspiration that was necessary for completion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

> Fools change in England and new Fools arise,
> For though th' Immortal Species never dies,
> Yet ev'ry Year new Maggots make new Flies.
> John Dryden

The general objective of this study is to test this hypothesis of Dryden's against the British novel of the 1940's in an effort to determine who are the "new Maggots" and "new Flies" of our era. Furthermore, this study will be seeking a particular kind of maggot and, ergo, a particular kind of fly; that is, the socialist "maggot," specifically the socialist ideology, and its proponent or opponent in British novel literature, the socialist-influenced novelist of the present decade. This statement, however, is intended to be only a figurative analogy, free from any implied judgment.

Bases of the Study

Justification for this study lies in agreement that today we are more concerned with socialism than the most visionary economist or politician could have foreseen a generation ago. To have or not to have socialism in one of its many and varied forms, or rather the extent to which we should acquiesce to the de facto existence of socialism in our society, has

become the paramount question of civilization, leaving no corner of the modern world untouched by its insistence.

Evidence for this agreement may be found in great abundance in the headlines that have dominated, and are continuing to dominate, the front pages of our daily newspapers for the past ten years. To review the general history of this period is unnecessary. It is essential, however, to consider pertinent that the military defeat of the fascist totalitarian powers in World War II resulted in reducing the number of the great world powers to two--the United States, a predominantly capitalistic country, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a nation which avowedly follows Marxian socialism--that these countries stand antagonistically as representatives of supposedly antithetical economic and political doctrines, that a majority of European countries are now ruled by governments constituted largely of professed socialists, and that in every civilized State followers of socialist principles are sufficiently numerous to attract considerable notice on the part of government, press and public opinion.

That this study should be even more justified in its concern with the influence of socialism on a facet of British culture is inherent in a recognition of the recent historical facts of the United Kingdom. Although the general election scheduled for 1940 was postponed because of the war, a parliamentary crisis which developed in the summer of that year over the failure of British arms in the Battle of France forced the

politicians to realize that "at this critical moment of the war what was needed was the formation of a government that would include members of His Majesty's Opposition, the Liberal and Labor parties."[1] The Liberal party fared poorly in this National Coalition, with the portfolios almost equally divided between Conservatives and Laborites, thus bringing the Labor party to an almost partnership share in the cabinet headed by the Conservative Premier, Winston Churchill.

Given a share of governmental responsibility, the socialists proved themselves competent and efficient administrators, at least in the eyes of 12,000,000 of the electorate, and beginning in 1943, they waged a subtle but relentless propaganda war on their Tory colleagues with such proposals as the Beveridge and Bevan Plans for the expansion of social security. That this campaign was efficacious can be judged by the sweeping victories of the Labor party in the first post-war general election in 1945. Since that time the Labor government of Prime Minister Clement Attlee has proceeded, according to plan, to carry out its program of gradual socialization of industry in the face of such obstacles as war-devastated plants, the loss of much of the country's export market, a seriously depleted exchequer, floods and catastrophic storms, strikes, and a severely rationed domestic economy.

---

[1]Neville Chamberlain, in a radio address to the British people on June 16, 1940; recorded by the Columbia Broadcasting Company in Columbia Masterworks Set MM-800.

During the period from August 1945 to the summer of 1949, the Labor government succeeded in nationalizing the Bank of England, the coal mines, inland transportation, electric power and gas industries, and the steel industry. It continued wartime controls over consumer goods, developed an extensive housing program and a city and regional planning program, instituted a national health insurance plan, extended social security and the previously commenced nationalization of civilian aviation and the cable and wireless services, and passed preliminary legislation to abolish those vestiges of power still remaining to the hereditary House of Lords. This has been called "an all-time record in respect of the amount of major legislation placed on the Statute Book."[2] By overcoming all tests of opposition in Parliament and gaining some ground in local and county by-elections, the socialist government has indicated that it is truly representative of the economic and political convictions of a consensus of Britons at present.

The difficulty of attempting to define the reflections of this movement in British culture inheres in the fact that the socialists are not a single unified group, but a heterogeneous federation of independent members, organizations (such as the Fabian Society), trades unions, and other parties (such as the Independent Labor party). The more than three million

---

[2]Labor and Industry in Britain, December 1946, p. 216, quoted by William Loucks and J. Weldon Hoot, Comparative Economics (New York: Harper and Brothers, third edition, 1948), p. 351.

party members vary in economic philosophy from the relatively "conservative" views of the Fabians to the "leftist" ones of the Independent Labor party. Many individuals, such as clerical workers and shopkeepers who are not doctrinaire socialists, are affiliated because they favor the party's immediate program. Indeed, the only respect in which there seems to be a common ground of opinion is that they all support a program favoring purchase rather than confiscation of industries for nationalization. They also agree to immediate objectives which include the socialization of about twenty per cent of the total economy before 1950 in the hope that "within twenty-five years the industry and natural resources of Great Britain will be completely socialized, thereby eliminating mass unemployment, ameliorating economic and social inequality, and increasing production."[3] The manner in which long-range objectives are to be realized is the subject of controversy.

Definitions

It should be obvious that, aside from the complexity of defining what the word socialism means, it is even more difficult to agree on the meaning of that elusive term in its application to British economic thinking. Since this study is concerned with the manifestations of socialism in contemporary British novel literature, it is unnecessary to construct a frame of reference which would apply to anything but British

---

[3] Ibid., p. 352.

socialism. For the purposes of this writing, then, *socialism* shall be understood to mean that movement in human thought and expression in Great Britain (*i.e.*, England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland) which was brought to focus in the doctrines laid down by Marx and Engels, as it has been interpreted in definitive literature by British writers and embodied in the policies and practices of the British Labor party and its affiliates and the Communist party of Great Britain.

This definition is intended in its broadest sense. But it should not be construed to refer to anything outside Great Britain except, possibly, the writings of Karl Marx, which, it will be remembered, were written mostly in London. It does not refer to British or other pre-Marxian socialism or to non-British interpretations of Marx, in the sense that such interpretations were made by writers who were not Britons. It does not refer to similarly labelled movements in the United States and other European countries, or to the current philosophy of the government of the Soviet Union.

This definition does not distinguish between what is called *socialism* and what is termed *communism* because such a distinction does not appear relevant for this writing. Both movements recognize Marx as their founder, and their differences seem to be those of the interpretation of his ideas. Except for these considerations, and for the fact that *communism* has become, in current parlance, a term of opprobrium, the two terms might be used synonymously here in reference to Marxism.

The following description of socialism by a British writer can be regarded as having some validity for this study:

> It is both abstract and concrete, theoretical and practical, idealist and materialist, very old and entirely modern; it ranges from a mere sentiment to a precise program of action; different advocates present it as a philosophy of life, a sort of religion, an ethical code, an economic system, a historical category, a juridical principle; it is a popular movement and a scientific analysis, an interpretation of the past and a vision of the future, a war cry and the negation of war, a violent revolution and a gentle revolution, a gospel of love and altruism, and a campaign of hate and greed, the hope of mankind and the end of civilization, the dawn of the millennium and a frightful catastrophe.[4]

This statement implies that to define socialism is to place upon it value judgments of assent or aversion, a concept of "goodness" or "badness", an argument pro or con, an advocacy or a refutation. This study is concerned with no *a priori* judgments or opinions regarding socialism. The definition framed for this study aims at an objective statement that certain things in the contemporary world are referred to by the language symbol *socialism* for the purposes of scientific investigation and there is no ground for propagandistic argument in this sort of undertaking.

The primary concern of this study is not socialism *per se* but literary expression in its relation to socialism. The underlying assumption upon which this is based is that

> that critical approach is most useful which involves relating the art of fiction at any given time to the civilization of which it is a part, and endeavoring to see all other questions of form, technique, style, and subject

---

[4]A. Shadwell, in *Quarterly Review*, July 1924, p. 2, quoted in Loucks and Hoot, p. 259.

matter against the background of this relationship.[5] If socialism can be said to be a predominant characteristic of contemporary British civilization, it seems appropriate to question the relationship which exists between it and the production of belles-lettres, which, as "only one of man's activities," is subject to all that may influence or condition human activity.[6]

The term contemporary has been used variously to designate everything from the occurrences of the past generation to those of most recent event. In the present context, contemporary should be understood to indicate the period covered by this study. Arbitrary limitation of meaning such as this is necessitated in the interests of unity of investigation. The currents of thought and expression, which take their cues from events, have shifted and changed many times in the past generation. It is hoped that by limiting inquiry to novels written during the period which corresponds roughly to the decade of the second World War, the years from 1940 through 1949, a greater measure of academic clarity will obtain.

The reasons for using the novel as the form of literary expression in which to seek for socialist influences are inherent in the conventions of that genre in British letters. Since its development in the eighteenth century the novel has

---

[5]David Daiches, The Novel and the Modern World (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939), p. 211.

[6]Rex Warner, "The State of Tomorrow," The Saturday Review of Literature, XXX (August 23, 1947), pp. 7 ff.

been used to embody economic, social and political "messages," criticisms of the status quo and advocacies of change, more than any other form of belles-lettres in the language. This is acknowledgeable in the typical novels of past generations, such as those by Dickens, Thackeray, Hardy and Galsworthy. Novelists, it has been said,

> . . . may be bad prophets, though perhaps no worse than the economists, but they are the first to record in detail social revolutions. They are the historians of our day.[7]

Coupled with this is the widely accepted critical opinion that the novel, as an art form, is a product of the rise of capitalism and has made its strongest appeal to the so-called "bourgeois" elements of society. If this is a valid criticism, is it not reasonable to expect the novel to be affected by changes in the social order which conceived and fostered it?

Since it is hardly within the pale of human capacity to be able to investigate with any satisfactory degree of critical analysis all of the British novels of the past decade, some system of selection must be exercised. Three more or less scientific bases for selection seem tenable. The first is to segregate from the total of present British novelists those authors who have done all of their work within the time specified and investigate the entirety of their production. That approach could not be taken in this study because there are not enough British novelists all of whose work is within the decade

---

[7]Harrison Smith, "The Literature of Transition," The Saturday Review of Literature, XXIV (July 26, 1941), p. 10.

of the 1940's to obtain sufficient evidence for a valid study. The second possibility is to choose a novel published during each year of the period. Besides the difficulty of selecting the most likely specimens, one would have considerable trouble finding a novel for each year of the present decade. If the critics can be believed, the period from 1940 to 1945 was one of relative inactivity in British literature.[8]

The third method, and perhaps the most haphazard and open to criticism, is the one that seems most feasible: to select a group of novels at random, attempting to cover the period as thoroughly as possible, from novelists whose literary reputations outside Britain were either well established in preceding periods or who have gained recognition by work done during the 1940's. Basing selection on the reputation of the writer outside Britain seems important in view of the fact that the study is being conducted in a country foreign to that in which the literature was produced and by a person with at least a non-British perspective. The basis for the study, the definitions of problems, the method of selection, the point of view, would doubtless be considerably different for a native student.

To the charge that such selection runs the risk of talking about works which may not be worth the bother, it can be answered that this study has no interest in weighing the

---

[8]George Orwell, "English Writing in Total War," The New Republic, CV (July 14, 1941), pp. 57-8.

artistic merit of the novels under consideration. The authors involved here have all received a fairly large voice of such criticism as exists in this field, and there seems to be no way of ascertaining what pieces of contemporary expression will survive this generation, if they stand up that long. The risk must be accepted in the realization that, if all students allowed it to deter them, critical investigation in the contemporary field would be throttled.

By the method described above, the novels selected for study were Elizabeth Bowen's The Heat of the Day, Ann Bridge's Singing Waters, Graham Greene's The Power and the Glory, R. C. Hutchinson's Elephant and Castle and The Fire and the Wood, Aldous Huxley's Ape and Essence, W. Somerset Maugham's The Razor's Edge, J. B. Priestley's Three Men in New Suits, Evelyn Waugh's Brideshead Revisited and Scott-King's Modern Europe. American editions have been used exclusively. Two books each by Evelyn Waugh and R. C. Hutchinson have been selected because they provide an opportunity for comparing work done at two widely separated times during the period under observation. Hutchinson's The Fire and the Wood was written in 1940, while his Elephant and Castle was published in 1949, affording a chance to observe changes in attitude that might have taken place as a result of the events that occurred during the interim. Waugh's Brideshead Revisited was written in 1945, during the war, and Scott-King's Modern Europe, his latest, was brought out in February 1949, allowing an equal opportunity to observe

reactions to changed situations.

In analyzing these novels the question for which an answer will be sought is to what extent modern British socialism has affected these literary productions. By further delineation the question might be stated to ask whether these novels reflect the events outlined above and whether the novelist has, consciously or unconsciously, pronounced judgment regarding them. This is not an attempt to psychoanalyze, to make categorical statements about, or even to question the intellectual integrity of these authors. If they make statements or inferences about socialism, one can but accept them as sincere expressions. This does not mean that one does not have the right to speculate and to look for evidence to indicate whether or not the idea was an author's own or whether he took it, in one form or another, from his milieu. If he expresses an idea which coincides with one expressed by Marx, Bernard Shaw, or the Webbs, even though he has never read Das Kapital, The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism, or The Decay of Capitalist Civilization, but has arrived as his notions "independently," his idea is not the less "socialist" for it, since it can be identified with an expression which fits into the definition advanced above. In this matter Daiches' statement seems quite pertinent:

> . . . If the artist were aware of the true origin and nature of his impulse he would probably be a much less effective artist, for self-consciousness of that kind has never been very good for art.[9]

---

[9]Daiches, p. 224.

Procedure

The first procedure to be employed in undertaking to formulate answers to these questions will be to investigate the actions and attitudes of characters presented in the novels in relation to the author's point of view regarding them. It shall be asked about each character that an author attempts to develop to any extent "why does this character behave in this particular way?" and "does the author consider him typical of any economic, social, political or psychological group and, if so, of what group?" In other words, the motivations of the character's behavior will be examined and, since psychology recognizes motivation only in terms of goals, it will be necessary to look for the goals toward which character behavior is directed. Once this has been noted, it will be possible to inquire about the author's feelings toward the character by observing how much he allows the character to accomplish in the working out of the plot, and the extent and nature of the author's interpolations and intrusions of judgment in this.

The second procedure to be followed, a more arduous and complex one, will be to investigate the use in these novels of language symbols relevant to socialism. An attempt will be made to determine whether the symbols have been used as terms of approval or disapproval and what significance such usage has in the understanding of the "meaning" of the particular novel involved.

CHAPTER II

CHARACTER MOTIVATION AS EVIDENCE

This chapter is further divided into separate discussions for each novel investigated. Each subdivision contains a discussion of the characters presented in a particular novel, the underlying assumptions of which are that one of the prime requisites for understanding the significance of a novel is to understand the characters presented in it and that the basic step in analyzing a character is to observe his behavior and its consequences and seek for an explanation of it. This analytic process has been employed chiefly on those characters upon whom the central attention is focused in the novels.

After each novel has been examined in this manner, a final section of this chapter will discuss the significance of the evidence thus obtained for the subject at hand and will correlate this evidence for the purpose of formulating a general pattern of information.

Elizabeth Bowen, The Heat of the Day

The Heat of the Day may be said to concern itself with the struggle for security on the part of four people in the wartime London of 1942, to each of whom the word security has

a particular meaning. The central character in the plotted action is Stella Rodney, a divorcee in her late thirties, a government worker from a family of landed gentry, and the mother of a young army recruit, who lives in a furnished flat in the West End. In a war environment which seems to lack permanency, she has attached herself to Captain Robert Kelway, a wounded veteran of Dunkirk, who is engaged in army staff work. In him she has found a "habitat"; their love affair has provided for them a "hermetic world."

Stella's motivation is to prevent the destruction of this pattern of life, in which she feels secure, at the hands of Harrison, a secret agent who tries to blackmail her into seduction with the information that Kelway is giving secrets to the enemy. This is her prime motive, but she has another: to secure for her son a sizable inheritance of land in Eire left to him by a relative of her dead divorced husband. In the latter attempt she is successful, but she is unable to keep the reality of her lover's treason from destroying her pattern of life and, eventually, Kelway himself.

Harrison's motive, in seeking to seduce Stella, is possession--possession of Stella and, perhaps more importantly, her "luxury" apartment and the shreds of class which still persist in her. He never achieves this, or even comes close, because Stella finds him as repulsive as Robert, in his treason, later becomes.

Running through the novel are passages given over to

Louie, a factory girl, who has no connection with the main plot but who, in many ways, is a parallel to Stella. Dispossessed, friendless and almost alone in a strange city, married to a soldier serving overseas whom she hardly knows, Louie tries to attract Harrison. When she is refused, she finds security in an almost fanatic devotion to reading newspapers, by which means she is able to project herself into the places and situations described in the news stories and escape the reality of her insecure existence.

It is Kelway, however, who provides the real problem of the novel. The motivation of his quest for security takes the form of a revolt from a security which he finds unpleasant, the middle-class concept of freedom. In his confession of guilt to Stella, he says:

> "Freedom to be what? -- the muddled, mediocre, damned. Good enough to die for freedom, for the good reason that it's the very thing which has made it impossible to live, so there's no alternative. Look at your free people -- mice let loose in the middle of the Sahara. It's insupportable -- what is it but a vacuum? Tell a man he's free and what does that do to him but send him trying to dive back into the womb? Look at it happening; look at your mass 'free' suckers, your democracy -- kidded along from the cradle to the grave. 'From the cradle to the grave, save, oh, save!' Do you suppose there's a single man of mind who doesn't realize <u>he</u> only begins where his freedom stops? One in a thousand may have what to be free takes -- if so, he has what it takes to be something better, and he knows it: who could want to be free when he could be strong? Freedom -- what a slaves' yammer! What do they think they are? I'd guarantee to guarantee to every man the exact degree of freedom of which he is capable -- I think you'd see that wouldn't carry us very far. As it is, what? As far as what's nothing can be anything, freedom's inorganic: it's owed at least to the few of us to have a part in strength. We must have something to envisage, and we must act, and there must be law. We must have

> law -- if necessary let it break us: to have been broken is to have been something."[1]

When Stella answers, "But law -- that's just what you break," he replies by saying: "Nothing I can break is law."[2] Later in the discussion he adds:

> ". . . I was born wounded; my father's son. Dunkirk was waiting there in us -- what a race! A class without a middle, a race without a country. Unwhole. Never earthed in -- and there are thousands of thousands of us, and we're still breeding -- breeding what? You may ask: I ask. Not only nothing to hold, nothing to touch. No source of anything in anything."[3]

Stella's refusal to accept this explanation for the deception leads to Kelway's suicide, tragically accomplishing what Harrison had failed to accomplish.

Ann Bridge, Singing Waters

Singing Waters is primarily a vehicle for a travelogue about the pre-war Balkan countries, particularly High Albania. The plotted action is almost entirely limited to the travels of an Anglo-American widow of the "international" social set, Mrs. Gloire Thurston, through Italy, Yugoslavia and Albania in the late 1930's. On the Istanbul express in Italy she meets Nils Larsen, a middle-aged Swede who is a touring representative of the International Labor Office in Geneva. In the course of their conversations on the train, he conveniently convinces her that she should go to High Albania to learn that life can have

---

[1]Elizabeth Bowen, The Heat of the Day (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949), pp. 302-3.

[2]Ibid. [3]Ibid., p. 307.

beauty even in the modern world. The remaining two-thirds of the novel describes her emotional experiences in the primitive Balkan country where she is converted to the points of view that Larsen has advanced in the opening chapters.

The novelist tells us at the outset of her story that "attractive" and "wealthy" Mrs. Thurston, embittered by the death of her husband in a mountain-climbing accident, is bored with her "fashionable" life and has contemplated suicide. She is in this condition when Larsen first observes her on the train, one of those

> . . . women whose way of living had given them habitually the cream of material life, the best food, wine, clothes, jewels, leaving them, it seemed, at last with nothing but a slightly supercilious distaste for these things. . . . It was perhaps part of the protective mechanism of those who live always in the public eye--not in the sense that statesmen and royalties do, whose actions are of some public importance, but in the curious modern fashion by which the politically obscure rich live mainly in public, being forever seen, forever described and photographed--the vulgar competitive publicity of "Society" where the capital S denotes its complete divorcement from human society at large.[4]

Pursuing his intuitions about Gloire's "unhappiness," Larsen begins a series of conversations which provide the motivation for her future behavior. The ideas he expresses, by being those to which she finally agrees, become the thesis of the novel by the determination of her actions. The process is abetted by the fact that almost every other character with whom she comes in contact in her travels restates some part of Larsen's philosophy.

---

[4]Ann Bridge, Singing Waters (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1946), p. 6.

The motivation for what Larsen says, since his behavior in the novel is largely verbal, seems to be his concern for Gloire's welfare and a desire to convert her to his point of view, to divert her from what he considers to be an "evil" materialism. The following is a piecing together of what Larsen has to say, which is essentially the ideation of the novel:

> "Civilisation is an affair of the mind and the soul, and of human and social relationships. Machinery is incidental to it, . . . By itself, it gives nothing and takes nothing--it entirely depends on whether society controls it or is controlled by it. But do not go on imagining that ice-boxes and electric washers and a jade-green telephone by your bed are the marks of civilisation, or have anything to do with it at all."[5]

> ". . . a whole hemisphere, which for nearly a century has been out of contact with aristocracy, is beginning to tell the world that it would be better without it! That is not true, any more than mental and physical equality is a reality; but those who have never seen aristocracy, and therefore know no better, believe it; and also those seize greedily on this false creed who have most to gain by it, the urban proletariat who, having neither traditions nor possessions, wish to exalt themselves by bringing all men down to their own level. And since they are many, and have the franchise, and the governments want votes, they are encouraged in this dangerous folly both by catch-penny statesmen and by the Press."[6]

> "And the 'classless society', . . . is not only crassly ugly, it is suicidal, and also it is false. There is no classless society, not anywhere in the world. Russia comes nearest to it, but even in Russia there are distinctions. Do the masses ride in cars? No--they ride in trams, or trudge along the pavement. Who then rides in those smart Russian-built limousines of which Moscow is full? The Commissars, the 'spetsi,' or experts, technicians as we should say, the opera-singers and the ballerinas, the new aristocracy of Russia."[7]

> "For almost the whole world today, . . . the great

---

[5] Ibid., p. 23. [6] Ibid., pp. 37-8. [7] Ibid., p. 40.

problem is how to combine mechanisation on the scale on which we now have it, with the good life. Human life has run on on much the same lines for four thousand years--sowing and reaping, spinning and weaving, cooking and eating food; loving and marriage, birth and death, the pursuit of knowledge, the creation of beauty, the service and adoration of God. And till the nineteenth century it has run at much the same tempo, the same pace. The one great shake-up before that was the discovery of the printing-press, which made it possible to disseminate ideas much more widely and rapidly than before. That, we have to some extent assimilated; man had adjusted himself to literacy, up to a point.

"But since the beginning of the nineteenth century have come also the steam engine and the internal combustion engine, the telegraph, the telephone, and the wireless; and these have altered the tempo of human life, and made it at once immensely more rapid, and infinitely more noisy than ever before. At the same time the invention of machinery and the flooding of the world with mass-produced goods have modified many aspects of human life; for instance man's sense of dependence on the soil and the weather--which reminds him daily of his dependence upon God; and also the workman's intelligent knowledge of what he is making, and his pleasure and pride in the work of his hands. Pleasure is of God--and any loss of pleasure is in itself a loss of part of man's dignity, and of that happiness which comes unsought. All this is having spiritual and psychological and nervous results, and mankind must adjust itself to the new conditions, or perish. We have not yet had time to measure these results fully; what we do already see is that cancer, crime, and nervous maladies are on the increase, in less than three generations."[8]

"It is America which will not let the world alone, . . . which holds up its way of life as the ideal for every nation, and seeks to impose its own standard of living--which many people think ridiculously and unwholesomely high--on others, partly of course in the search for markets. If it were openly stated that it <u>was</u> just a search for markets, that would be one thing, but it is not; by a tremendous propaganda campaign this materialistic conception is held up as an ideal, as somehow part of liberty, and above all, as a form of happiness. To search for markets is legitimate, but to make a virtue of so doing is not. Most of all it is a crime to dress up salesmanship in the garments of philanthropy, and to try to drag

---

[8]<u>Ibid.</u>, p. 47-8.

> spiritual values into advertising. Those are false gods indeed, debasing ones--and we who see their falsity have the duty to protect ourselves from them. That is the one unforgivable sin, the sin against the light."[9]
>
> "Whatever the method of improving humanity and of raising men to a higher position than they occupy today may be, and whenever and however the millennium may be reached, it is not to be reached by declaring in favour of class consciousness and class antagonism, hatred between one class and another. The problem we have to solve is an educational and moral problem. No political constitution can enfranchise a people, no possessions can enrich them, no rank or title can ennoble them, unless they have solid, manly character and wholesome honesty, as the granite rock upon which they are built."[10]

Graham Greene, The Power and the Glory

The Power and the Glory deals with the persecution of the Roman Catholic church under a presumably socialistic government in a province of Mexico in the pre-war 1930's. The central characters are a middle-aged Catholic priest, the last of his calling remaining in the province, who is preoccupied with a sense of sin-guilt in his furtive ministrations during flight from government persecution, and a young police lieutenant who is his pursuer. The plotted action is essentially that of "hare and hounds," ending with the execution of the priest and the arrival in the province of a new one to take his place.

The prime motivation of the priest is to escape capture and, if possible, extricate himself from the mortal sin of adultery. He does not succeed in accomplishing either end.

---

[9] Ibid., pp. 49-50 [10] Ibid., p. 297.

At the conclusion, his death is recognized as a sort of martyrdom.

The police lieutenant's concern is with capturing the priest, not because of any animosity toward him, but because the priest is a symbol of the evils of the social order which the officer passionately wishes to correct. The narrator points this up in the opening chapter by describing the lieutenant's feelings:

> . . . All his life had lain here: the Syndicate of Workers and Peasants had once been a school. He had helped to wipe out that unhappy memory. The whole town was changed: the cement playground up the hill near the cemetery where iron swings stood like gallows in the moony darkness was the site of the cathedral. The new children would have new memories: nothing would ever be as it was. . .[11]

The conflicting ideologies of the priest and the lieutenant are presented in the conclusion of the novel in a discussion between them following the priest's capture. The lieutenant begins by condemning religion:

> ". . . What an excuse it all was, what a fake. Sell all and give to the poor--that was the lesson, wasn't it?--and Senora So-and-so, the druggist's wife, would say the family wasn't really deserving of charity, and Senor This, That and the Other would say that if they starved, what else did they deserve, they were Socialists anyway, and the priest--you--would notice who had done his Easter duty and paid his Easter offering. . . . You're a danger. That's why we kill you. I have nothing against you, you understand, as a man."[12]

When the priest retorts that "It's God you're against," the

---

[11]Graham Greene, The Power and the Glory (New York: The Viking Press, 1946), p. 32.

[12]Ibid., p. 260.

lieutenant answers: "No,I don't fight against a fiction." Then he goes on with:

> "It's your ideas. . . . You are so cunning, you people. But tell me this--what have you ever done in Mexico for us? Have you ever told a landlord he shouldn't beat his peon--oh, yes, I know, in the confessional perhaps, and it's your duty, isn't it, to forget it at once? You come out and have dinner with him and it's your duty not to know that he has murdered a peasant. That's all finished. He's left it behind in your box."[13]

> "Well, we have ideas too. . . . No more money for saying prayers, no more money for building places to say prayers in. We'll give people food instead, teach them to read, give them books. We'll see they don't suffer."[14]

The priest starts to reply: "But if they want to suffer...," when the lieutenant retorts quickly: "A man may want to rape a woman. Are we to allow it because he wants to? Suffering is wrong."[15]

The priest begins his counter-argument by saying:

> ". . . It's no good your working for your end unless you're a good man yourself. And there won't always be good men in your party. Then you'll have all the old starvation, beating, get-rich-anyhow. But it doesn't matter so much my being a coward--and all the rest. I can put God into a man's mouth just the same--and I can give him God's pardon. It wouldn't make any difference to that if every priest in the Church was like me."[16]

The lieutenant rejoins:

> "I've had to think things out for myself. But there are some things which you don't have to learn in a school. That there are rich and poor. . . . I've shot three hostages because of you. Poor men. It made me hate your guts."[17]

The conclusion of the argument comes when the priest asks:

---

[13] Ibid., p. 261. [14] Ibid., p. 261-62. [15] Ibid.

[16] Ibid., p. 263. [17] Ibid., p. 267.

". . . You hate the rich and love the poor. Isn't that right?"

"Yes."

"Well, if I hated you, I wouldn't want to bring up my child to be like you. It's not sense."

"That's just twisting . . ."

"Perhaps it is. I've never got your ideas straight. We've always said the poor are blessed and the rich are going to find it hard to get into heaven. Why should we make it hard for the poor man too? Oh, I know we are told to give to the poor, to see they are not hungry--hunger can make a man do evil as much as money can. But why should we give the poor power? It's better to let him die in dirt and wake in heaven--so long as we don't push his face in the dirt."

"I hate your reasons. . . . I don't want reasons. If you see somebody in pain, people like you reason and reason. You say--perhaps pain's a good thing, perhaps he'll be better for it one day. I want to let my heart speak."

"At the end of a gun."

"Yes. At the end of a gun."[18]

Finally, the lieutenant, observing his victim's nervousness, concludes:

"You don't trust Him much, do you? He doesn't seem a grateful kind of God. If a man served me as well as you've served Him, well, I'd recommend him for promotion, see he got a good pension . . . If he was in pain, with cancer, I'd put a bullet through his heart."[19]

R. C. Hutchinson, Elephant and Castle

Writing in the tradition of Galsworthy's Forsyte Saga and Roger Martin du Gard's Les Thibaults, R. C. Hutchinson, in Elephant and Castle, a very complex work, presents the story of a social-conscious upper-middle-class girl who marries a juvenile delinquent of Italian extraction from a London slum in an attempted social welfare project and, some twenty years

---

[18] Ibid., pp. 267-68. [19] Ibid., p. 269.

and one hundred characters later, is murdered for her efforts.

The action of the story covers the period corresponding roughly to the interim between the two World Wars and its narration is presented from several different points of view, with a myriad of characters and an unresolved sub-plot. The central character, however, is Armorel Cepinnier, daughter of a wealthy, matriarchal, "eccentric" family. Her dominant motivation is to reform and "make something of" Gian Ardree, whom she chances to see in a street fight for which he is given a prison sentence. From this goal of educating young Ardree and raising him up to her standards she allows nothing to deter her and finally traps him into marriage in order to accomplish it. When her friends and family look askance at this marriage between people of such widely different social classes, her confidante, Elizabeth Kinfowell, remarks:

> "I doubt if poverty or wealth has anything to do with it. I know a bit about these things. People from the opposite ends of the economic pole can join up and live in perfect contentment. . . . The question is always whether people accept the same fundamentals."[20]

Although Gian has no desire to be "uplifted," he consents to Armorel's educating ministrations out of motives of genuine love. Faithfully, out of an inarticulate sense of deep devotion, he follows her plans for night school courses, learns a trade and eventually becomes a skilled artisan, and practices speech improvement. Armorel sacrifices her social

---

[20]R. C. Hutchinson, Elephant and Castle (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1949), p. 310.

position to accomplish her mission by taking an apartment in one of London's worst slums and, by long and arduous work, makes an attractive home of it.

While on the surface Armorel's motivation passes for selfless altruism, it becomes apparent in the latter parts of the novel that she is prompted by more selfish motives. Her attempts to reform Gian, in whom she loses faith, lead her into a "martyr complex" in which she imagines that her family and all of her friends have joined forces against her. In this state she tries to prevent her daughter's attachment to Elizabeth's illegitimate son, the sensitive, artistic Michael, by pretending to Michael that her daughter is also the illegitimate progeny of his father. When Gian discovers the story he is enraged and disillusioned. He contemplates killing her, but decides to reconcile with her only to find that it is too late. His father, bitter over his son's unhappiness, stabs her to death and Gian is sentenced to die for her murder.

By the stylistic technique of varying the point of view of narration from direct impersonal, to letters, to the reflections of Armorel's aristocratic bachelor cousin, Raymond, who

> . . . possessed to the verge of lunacy a middle-class reluctance to destroy anything which could be remotely described as having "family interest."[21]

the novelist allows the reader to develop a feeling of objectivity

---

[21] Ibid., p. 151.

in seeing the story of Armorel and Gian unfold. This device also allows the author to bring in, unobtrusively, an assortment of characters from different classes whose lives cross only in their relation to the two central figures. Much of the ideation of the novel is presented in these minor characters and in their relations to the slum environment which plays such a vital role in the determination of the motivation. For example, Gian, assigned to an office construction job, complains:

> "The way I see it, it's no sort of fumin' good. Kids all over the place--they want somewhere to live in, somewhere to muck about. Lot of fumin' good a bunch of offices is to them."[22]

And Trevon Grist, the diseased, self-effacing director of a charity boys' club in the slums, reacts to this environment by saying: "These people here--my God, have you looked at them? The pullulating aftermath of the Disraelian age!"[23]

The political philosophy of some of the tenement dwellers is pointed up in a discussion in Trevon's apartment between some of the members of his club:

> "You're too bloody conservative, Frank. You never want to see anything changed . . ."
> . . . "Conservative? I'll tell you what I'd do with Conservatives--friends of yourn or not, Bulky--I'd stand 'em in one long row over on Tower Bridge there and jack up the bascles, I mean that."
>
> . . . . . .
>
> . . . "I reckon they got as much right to their opinion as you have to yours, Mr. 'Ughes."

---

[22]Ibid., p. 214 [23]Ibid., p. 172.

> "Yes--an' what have their opinions done for blokes like you an' me? Keep the standard of livin' down to bedrock, then you get easy labour--any mug can see that. . . . Well, then, all they got to do is to run the laws accordin'. Send their lads to Eton and such, work each of 'em into Parliament an' they got the thing rigged, world without end amen. Course, the workin'-man get wise to it now an' again--then it's time for the rulin' class to turn round an' say 'See here, lads, we got a war comin' on, all got to pull on the same rope for home an' country!' That's what's goin' on now--see it in the papers if you've got your eyes in your head."
>
> . . ."Only four words left out, Frankie. Come in Chapter Five."
>
> "You don't think there's any hope for re-educating the ruling class?" Trevon asked.
>
> "Re-educate 'em with a noose!"[24]

Again and again the importance of the slum environment in the lives of the characters is emphasized. At one point, when Armorel and Gian attempt to find out who owns their dilapidated tenement house, they find that

> . . . all that machinery worked from the impetus of periphrastic documents, brown with age, which lay in black tin boxes in the vaults of various banks; it was operated at several points by aged clerks with palsey who engrossed abstractions of titles in a spidery hand and by captive youths whose thoughts were on next Saturday's football; and few of the parties concerned knew anything about the others except, in some cases, their names.[25]

R. C. Hutchinson, The Fire and the Wood

The Fire and the Wood is one of a group of similarly constituted novels written in the late 1930's and early '40's to depict the "evils" of Naziism. The protagonist of this story, a young German-Jewish doctor, is engaged in experiments to perfect a vaccine for tuberculosis. As a result of the

---

[24] Ibid., p. 344. [25] Ibid., p. 230.

Nazi coup d'etat, he is dismissed from his hospital, arrested, and confined to a concentration camp. In prison he contracts tuberculosis, but his escape is effected by a half-literate peasant girl on whom he has conducted some successful experiments in his study and who has fallen in love with him. After a "hare and hounds" sequence the two make their way to England ,where they die of tuberculosis after delivering the doctor's laboratory notes safely into the hands of English physicians.

The primary motivation of the doctor is to bring to fruition, regardless of cost, his work on the tuberculosis serum. Later, of course, this motivation is altered somewhat by motives of escape from persecution to find security so that he may carry on his experiments. In this respect his goal is not so much personal safety as the saving of his formulae and laboratory notes from Nazi confiscation. In the beginning, his medical interests lead him to believe that "it is the many we have to think of. The Individual does not matter."[26] As a result of his discovery of love for Minna, the peasant girl, and his flight from persecution, this idea changes to a realization that the individual is all-important.

The antagonistic element of the novel, the Hitler regime, is presented in the characters of German citizens with whom Doctor Zepichmann comes in contact. Few of these minor characters are doctrinaire Nazis. They are portrayed, instead,

---

[26]R. C. Hutchinson, The Fire and the Wood (New York: The Literary Guild of America, Inc., 1940), p. 74.

as "ordinary citizens" or "little people" who display attitudes which contribute to Naziism: militant nationalism, dissatisfaction with post-World War I economic and political conditions, and willingness to blame these conditions on Jews and Marxists. The first of these attitudes is expressed, typically, by one of Doctor Zepichmann's German superiors at the hospital in these words:

> ". . . Of course, we must always remember first of all that we are citizens of a great nation. We must be ready at any moment to devote ourselves, everything we have, to our national duty."[27]

The tendency to attribute the disrupted economic order and social unrest to Jews and Communists, who assume the same identity in popular belief, is voiced by an elderly man:

> "Communists, you see! The young men hereabouts are mostly that way. Sunday nights, they have to smash something to keep themselves amused."

And to Zepichmann, a Jew, he adds: ". . . People of your kind, they want to keep quiet as much as possible."[28] Essentially the same attitude is expressed again by another man as follows:

> "Government! . . . I don't mind saying that some of the things I've heard would surprise you. . . . They fix it up, . . . they fix it all up with the Communists. It suits their book, you see, to keep us a beaten country. Suits the social-democrats too--a strong country wouldn't put up with them, for five minutes."[29]

These ideas affect the central character by making him an unwitting, and certainly an innocent, victim. Because he unconsciously befriends a group of Marxists, he is branded a

---

[27] Ibid., pp. 7-8. [28] Ibid., pp. 13-14.

[29] Ibid., p. 48.

Communist, in addition to the "crime" of being a Jewish doctor. After his arrest, his landlord, a retired sailor who has had nothing to do with his capture, boasts:

> ". . . But you can't get things cleared up all in a day, you've got to lie low and watch 'em, those young Marxists. You've got to just bide your time till they make a false step and give 'emselves away. He thought he'd got me fooled, that young Herr Doktor Lenin-Trotsky-Zepichmann --but I knew I'd catch him in the end!"[30]

Aldous Huxley, Ape and Essence

By the unusual device of writing his story in the form of a movie scenario, Mr. Huxley, in Ape and Essence, seeks to project the reader into an imaginary world of 2108 A. D., to portray a civilization which has barely survived a total atomic war. The story centers around a scientist from New Zealand, one of the few countries which have escaped destruction in World War III, who is a member of an expedition to re-discover America. In southern California the scientist, Dr. Poole, finds a race of sub-humans who exist on the remnants of pre-atomic civilization and worship Belial. Left behind by the fleeing explorers, he falls in love with one of the girls ("vessels") of this sub-human race and, together, they try to escape to an outlaw community to the north.

Much of the ideation of the novel is presented in the narrative voice which the scenario technique affords. Since there is little which can be called plotted action in the novel, the author also depends quite heavily for the expression

---

[30] Ibid., p. 237.

of ideas on the "quest" for information on the part of the protagonist, Dr. Poole, and in this character's reaction to the information provided. The novel attempts to present a panoramic view of what an atomic-destroyed society could be like and to formulate some logic by which this kind of society could be prevented from coming into existence.

In the introductory chapter it is brought out that the story to be presented is a screen play written in the present era by an eccentric California rancher and discovered in Hollywood by the author, in first person singular, in a pile of rejected manuscripts.

Dr. Poole, as merely an investigative agent, has no discernible motivation at the beginning of the novel. Toward the end his concern with motives of sex and self-preservation is treated only very lightly. The other characters in the story are used only as agents of information, either by relating matters directly to the hero or by acting out situations under his observation. Repeatedly, side comment is introduced by the "narrator" or an unseen chorus, or a montage of sights and sounds, or all three in various combinations. This unusual technique is essential to much of the expression of the novel.

The day of the discovery of the scenario, the narrator relates, was the day of Gandhi's assassination. This enters his thoughts and he begins:

> . . . from the Parthenon and the Timaeus a specious logic leads to the tyranny which, in the Republic, is held up

> as the ideal form of government. In the field of politics the equivalent of a theorem is a perfectly disciplined army; of a sonnet or picture, a police state under a dictatorship. The Marxist calls himself scientific and to this claim the Fascist adds another: he is a poet --of a new mythology. Both are justified in their pretensions; for each applies to human situations the procedures which have proved effective in the laboratory and the ivory tower. They simplify, they abstract, they eliminate all that, for their purposes, is irrelevant and ignore whatever they choose to regard as inessential; they impose a style, they compel the facts to verify a favorite hypothesis, they consign to the waste paper basket all that, to their mind, falls short of perfection. And because they act thus like good artists, sound thinkers and tried experimenters, the prisons are full, political heretics are worked to death as slaves, the rights and preferences of mere individuals are ignored, the Gandhis are murdered and from morning till night a million schoolteachers and broadcasters proclaim the infallibility of the bosses who happen at the moment to be in power.[31]

This passage sets the tone of the novel. In ideation it is repeated and emphasized in passages of blank verse chanted by a chorus, or recited by the narrator, in the scenario, as follows:

> Church and State
> Greed and Hate:--
> Two Baboon-Persons in one Supreme Gorilla.[32]
>
> Whom shall we persecute, for whom feel pity?
> It is all a matter of the moment's mores,
> Of words on wood pulp, of radios roaring,
> Of Communist kindergartens or first communions.
> Only in the knowledge of his own Essence
> Has any man ceased to be many monkeys.[33]
>
> Conscience, custom--the first makes cowards,
> Makes saints of us sometimes, makes human beings.
> The other makes Patriots, Papists, Protestants,
> Makes Babbitts, Sadists, Swedes or Slovaks,
> Makes killers of Kulaks, chlorinators of Jews,

---

[31]Aldous Huxley, Ape and Essence (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948), pp. 6-7.

[32]Ibid., p. 46. [33]Ibid., p. 75.

> Makes all who mangle, for lofty motives,
> Quivering flesh, without qualm or question,
> To mar their certainty of Supreme Service.[34]

Throughout these parts the narrator's voice intrudes with the main theme: "Ends are ape-chosen; only the means are man's."[35]

The scenario begins with a symbolic portrayal of modern civilization--a group of apes engaged in various "typical" human activities. After brief narrative interruptions there follows a symbolic portrayal of World War III--an army of apes forcing miniature Albert Einsteins to destroy them with atomic and bacteriological weapons. Following several unusual cinematic sound effects, the main story of Dr. Poole is commenced. The explorers, on their way to America, discuss the facts of World War III. Again the narrator enters with:

> . . . fear casts out even a man's humanity. And fear, my good friends, fear is the very basis and foundation of modern life. Fear of the much touted technology which, while it raises our standard of living, increases the probability of our violently dying. Fear of the science which takes away with one hand even more than what it so profusely gives with the other. Fear of the demonstrably fatal institutions for which, in our suicidal loyalty, we are ready to kill and die. Fear of the Great Men whom we have raised, by popular acclaim, to power which they use, inevitably, to murder and enslave us. Fear of the War we don't want and yet do everything we can to bring about.[36]

The post-atomic race which Dr. Poole finds dwelling in the ruins of southern California, exhuming the bodies of twentieth century inhabitants to provide clothing and ornaments, trying desperately to forestall the complete liquidation which

---

[34] Ibid., pp. 133-4. [35] Ibid., p. 45. [36] Ibid., p.51.

they feel certain is coming shortly, are worshippers of Belial, the devil. They feel that Belial has overwhelmed the forces of God in the atomic war and is now in control of the world. This religion has its hierarchy headed by

> . . . "His Eminence the Arch-Vicar of Belial, Lord of the Earth, Primate of California, Servant of the Proletariat, Bishop of Hollywood."[37]

It is this Arch-Vicar who undertakes to enlighten Dr. Poole about the post-atomic world and set forth an explanation of how it got that way. He attributes it all to Belial, saying:

> . . . "Needless to say nobody ever gets anything for nothing. God's bounties have their price, and Belial always sees that it's a stiff one. Take those machines, for example. Belial knew perfectly well that, in finding a little alleviation from toil, flesh would be subordinated to iron and mind would be made the slave of wheels. He knew that if a machine is foolproof it must also be skill-proof, talentproof, inspirationproof. Your money back if the product should be faulty, and twice your money back if you can find in it the smallest trace of genius or individuality!"[38]
>
> . . . . . .
>
> ". . . Yes, Belial foresaw it all--the passage from hunger to imported food, from imported food to booming population, and from booming population back to hunger again. . . . The New Hunger, the Higher Hunger, the hunger of enormous industrialized proletariats, the hunger of city dwellers with money, with all the modern conveniences, with cars and radios and every imaginable gadget, the hunger that is the cause of total wars and the total wars that are the cause of yet more hunger."[39]
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "Progress and Nationalism--those were the two great ideas He put into their heads. Progress--the theory that

---

[37] Ibid., p. 104. [38] Ibid., p. 121. [39] Ibid., p. 123.

you can get something for nothing; the theory that you can gain in one field without paying for your gain in another; the theory that you alone understand the meaning of history; the theory that you know what's going to happen fifty years from now; the theory that, in the teeth of all experience, you can foresee all the consequences of your present actions; the theory that Utopia lies just ahead and that, since ideal ends justify the most abominable means, it is your privilege and duty to rob, swindle, torture, enslave and murder all those who, in your opinion (which is, by definition, infallible), obstruct the onward march to the earthly paradise. Remember that phrase of Karl Marx's: "Force is the midwife of Progress." He might have added--but of course Belial didn't want to let the cat out of the bag at the early stage of the proceedings--that Progress is the midwife of Force. Doubly the midwife, for the fact of technological progress provides people with the instruments of ever more indiscriminate destruction, while the myth of political and moral progress serves as the excuse for using those means to the very limit. I tell you, my dear sir, an undevout historian is mad. The longer you study modern history, the more evidence you find of Belial's Guiding Hand. . . . And then there was Nationalism--the theory that the state you happen to be subject to is the only true god, and that all other states are false gods; that all these gods, true as well as false, have the mentality of juvenile delinquents; and that every conflict over prestige, power or money is a crusade for the Good, the True and the Beautiful. The fact that such theories came, at a given moment in history, to be universally accepted is the best proof of Belial's existence, the best proof that at long last He'd won the battle.[40]

. . . . . .

". . . Belial had plenty of allies--the nations, the churches, the political parties. He used their prejudices. He exploited their ideologies. By the time they'd developed the atomic bomb, he had people back in the state of mind they were in before 900 B.C."[41]

In their concluding conversation, Dr. Poole remarks:

". . . I liked what you said about the contacts between East and West--how He persuaded each side to take only the

---

[40] Ibid., pp. 125-6. [41] Ibid., p. 184.

worst the other had to offer. So the East takes Western nationalism, Western armaments, Western movies and Western Marxism; the West takes Eastern despotism, Eastern superstitions and Eastern indifference to individual life. In a word, He saw to it that mankind should make the worst of both worlds."[42]

To this observation the Arch-Vicar adds:

"Just think if they'd made the best! . . . Eastern mysticism making sure that Western science should be properly used; the Eastern art of living refining Western energy; Western individualism tempering Eastern totalitarianism."[43]

W. Somerset Maugham, The Razor's Edge

Two types of motivation are used in The Razor's Edge which, for present purposes, shall be designated "philosophic" and "materialistic." The latter is, perhaps, rather narrow as a term describing the motives of characters who want everything from objects of wealth to such abstractions as social prominence, but the terms will suffice to distinguish between the two main types of security which are the goals of the major and minor characters.

The best examples of these two motivations are the two central figures in the novel: Larry Darrell, a young veteran of World War I whose military experiences have aroused in him a desire to find a philosophy of life, and Isabel Bradley, a beautiful girl who wants the comforts and luxuries which material wealth affords. In the plotted action which follows as a consequence of the conflict of these diverse

---

[42] Ibid., p. 184. [43] Ibid., pp. 184-5.

motives, Larry refuses Isabel's love and the possibility of wealth to set out on an Odyssean quest for faith which takes him through France and Germany to India. Isabel, though continuing to love Larry, marries a millionaire and, when her husband loses his fortune in the financial panic in 1929, inherits considerable wealth from an eccentric uncle. The determination of the motivation is that Larry finds his philosophy of life in Vedanta (Hindu mysticism), while Isabel gets her material comfort and security.

While Larry is the only character in the novel with a "philosophic" motivation, the other characters are but extensions of Isabel's materialism, with the possible exception of one character who is trying to escape from the reality of a tragic life. Although the other characters realize their motives in the outcome of the novel, the author attempts to demonstrate that theirs is a shallow happiness compared with that which Larry finds in mystic faith. Since the narrative is in first person, the characters cannot be treated subjectively, but the attempt to demonstrate the superiority of Larry's motivation is handled by giving over the largest portion of narrative interest to him and the author's insertion that

> . . . it may be that the way of life that he has chosen for himself and the peculiar strength and sweetness of his character may have an ever-growing influence over his fellow men so that, long after his death perhaps, it may be realized that there lived in this age a very remarkable creature.[44]

---

[44]W. Somerset Maugham, The Razor's Edge (New York: Pocket Books, Inc., Pocket Book Edition, 1946), p. 2.

J. B. Priestley, Three Men in New Suits

When Alan Strete, Herbert Kenford, and Eddie Mold, three English veterans of World War II, dressed in new army-issued "utility" civilian suits of blue, grey and brown respectively, returned to their native villages in "Banfordshire" in 1945, they expected to find a post-war world that would somehow be better than the one they left behind. Though they were of different social classes--Alan, the younger son of Lady Strete and the late Sir William whose ancestors had occupied Swansford Manor for centuries, Herbert, the younger son of a freehold farmer, Eddie, an unskilled quarry laborer--they had served in the ranks of the same infantry battalion through some of the most violent campaigns of the war and had seen their class distinctions swept away by the pressure of danger and the common military undertaking. They were vague and confused in their notions of the "better world" they felt that they had earned a right to live in, but they were certain that it would have to be different from their pre-war world.

This is the situation presented at the beginning of Priestley's short novel, Three Men in New Suits. The remainder of the story concerns itself with describing the real post-war world which the three men find, their reactions to it, and their arrival at the idea that what they want is a cooperative, rather than a competitive, social order. This is a novel in which the plotted action is subordinated to the ideation.

The main motivation of the three central characters is the same, the desire to live in a better and more secure world, but the characters and situations which provide the impetus for it are different in each case. On the surface the problems of the three men would seem to be those typical of veterans' rehabilitation to civilian life. In this story, however, it is the world which is maladjusted, not the veteran. Fundamentally, the motivation of all three men is stated by Alan as a conscious realization that

> ". . . either the earth must soon be the miserable grave of our species or it must be at last our home, where men can live at peace and can work for other men's happiness."[45]

The causes of Alan's disillusionment with the post-war order of things are, chronologically, the smug complacency of his family, the observations by his eccentric Uncle Rodney that the modern world is in a state of "disintegration," and the demonstrated attempts by members of his class with whom he comes in contact to entrench themselves as the dominant economic and social group. Though he scoffs at his uncle's diatribes, he sees in them the indictment of his class. Later he tells the other two veterans:

> ". . . I have an old uncle here--he's a fantastic museum piece but no fool--and he told me what it was--disintegration, sheer disintegration. The class they belong to, their kind of society, is simply dropping to pieces. They all accuse each other of being barmy--and they're right. There isn't anything more for them to do as a

---

[45]J. B. Priestley, Three Men in New Suits (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1945), p. 216.

> special class, but they can't--or won't--come out into the main road with the crowd and go somewhere."[46]

Herbert Kenford's discontent begins at a family homecoming party held in his honor at which his father announces that the family has "looked after" Herbert during his absence by purchasing a farm for him. Torn between a desire to conform to his family's wishes and his desire to make a "better world," Herbert, who "could not think yet in terms of work, property, money", is admonished by Doris Morgan, a young factory worker for whom he conceives an attachment, to turn down his family's offer:[47]

> ". . . Whatever you do, don't go back on what you're beginning to feel now. Don't let 'em make you comfortable. Don't let 'em stop you thinking. Don't let 'em persuade you we can go on in the same old way, not caring what happens to other people. We're all tied up together. . . . We can't help it--that's our life--and if we aren't all together, working and thinking for each other, then it's all hate and misery and bloody murder--honest to God it is."[48]

The conflict between Eddie Mold and the post-war world is simpler, but perhaps more shattering in implication. Eddie returns to find that his wife has been a prostitute for American soldiers stationed in their village during his absence. In the heat of anger and rage he gets drunk, turns his wife out, and finds that he has become the laughing stock of the villagers. He becomes embroiled in a tavern fight, is tormented by a scandalmonger, and is alternately threatened and cajoled by his employer, a parson and a policeman. Feeling that

---

[46] Ibid., p. 204. [47] Ibid., p. 58. [48] Ibid., p. 144.

he is on the verge of violence, he sets out in search of Alan for guidance and en route meets Herbert Kenford.

Reunited at Swansford Manor, the three men in new suits relate their problems to each other and attempt to solve them. Herbert crystallizes his problem by saying:

> ". . . I couldn't stand hearing my father and brother talking as if nobody else mattered but our family, and that all we had to do was to grab our bits of land and farm them and then get as much out of everybody else as we could. We've had all that before--and look where it got us."
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "I don't know what I want yet. . . . Haven't had time to think about it properly. Don't know enough yet. I'm going to try and find out what'll work the best. But that's the point. Not what suits us best, in our little corner, but what's for everybody. Farming is what I know, so I'd like to do that, but I don't care whether I run my own farm or join with other chaps in some sort of agricultural co-operative or go and work on a collective farm, Russian style. What I can't stand any longer, not after what we've been through, is all this old stupid greedy grabbing and screaming, like a lot of half-starved dogs round a lump of horse meat."[49]

The result of this discussion is the formulation by Alan of a philosophy to which the other two and later Diana, Alan's sister, agree. The following selected statements by Alan are contained in the closing pages of the novel. They are the outcome of the story, and thus the determination of motives of the three characters involved:

> ". . . We mustn't try to save something special for ourselves that the mass of people mustn't have. . . . If we try to go on in the same old way--competing and grabbing and scrapping, trying to make the same old rotten

---

[49] Ibid., p. 201.

formulas work, then we'll have huge slumps, unemployment, semi-starvation again. People will soon be bitter and angry. The fight for markets will be fiercer than ever. That means more wars, more bloody revolutions, and probably more mad dictators. Then very soon we'll all be half-starved and half-crazy, living underground and making thousand-ton rockets."[50]

. . . . . .

". . . If we can work together to destroy and to kill, then surely to God we can work together to build up and to create new life."[51]

. . . . . .

". . . We try to remember that it's much more important--and much more fun--to create than to possess. It's also much better to live uncomfortably, on short rations, as the Russians did, in a society that knows what it's doing and where it's going, than it is to lead a luxurious existence--for a little while--in a society that's wobbling from one disaster to the next. Instead of guessing and gambling we plan. Instead of competing, we co-operate."[52]

. . . . . .

". . . I know now what our problem is. It isn't how to produce a few brilliantly gifted individuals, how to procure for one small class the utmost luxury and refinement, how to give enormous power to a few groups, how to produce two or three colossal monuments of art or learning. Modern man is essentially co-operative and communal man. What we do best--and better than men have ever done in earlier ages--is never something that an individual can do but always something that men have to create together. And our problem . . . is how to use this power of working together for the benefit of the largest possible common human denominator. There's something in us now that will not rest nor find any lasting satisfaction while most human beings still exist in poverty, ignorance and despair. We have to make the round earth our home. We have at last to have faith in people, compassion for people, whether they have white faces, brown faces or black faces. This hope of a home on earth, this faith and this compassion are now at the very centre of our lives. If we're moved by them, if we base all our actions on them, we begin to live, drawing strength from the waters

---

[50] Ibid., pp. 210-11. [51] Ibid., p. 213. [52] Ibid., p. 214.

> of life. But if we pretend they aren't there, if we try to ignore the great task, then we cheat ourselves into cruelty and murder, sink into madness, turn into stone. And--by Heaven!--politics, economics, psychology, philosophy, religion--though they still speak with different voices, they all look the same way now."[53]

Evelyn Waugh, Brideshead Revisited

Brideshead Revisited is the story of a family of the English aristocracy living in a state akin to "degeneration" produced by the interaction of their characters on one another and the modern world, but saved from complete dissolution by the inward pull of Catholicism, which they try overtly to reject in one way or another. The ideation of the novel is, thus, an earlier statement of what the novelist repeated in Scott-King's Modern Europe: that the modern world, in itself, is irredeemably barbaric and the only thing which can give it order and unity is a return to older, traditional forms and concepts.

Narrated in the first person as simply a series of personal memoirs of the period corresponding roughly to that between the two World Wars, the novel is concerned with the actions of the members of the Flyte family, of Brideshead manor, in their attempts to revolt from the domination of a pious mother and the religion which she represents so that they can pursue personal motives of pleasure. The narrator, a close friend of the family who becomes involved in their lives, enters the story as one of the central figures.

---

[53] Ibid., pp. 215-16.

By the return of the various members of Brideshead's family to Catholicism, or a facet of it, after the death of Lady Marchmain and, especially, by the deathbed repentance of old Lord Marchmain, the determination of the motives becomes complete. Since Lord Marchmain is the most successful of the family in pursuing objectives of personal pleasure, his reconversion is symbolic of the contradiction of the fact that such motives have any validity. Catholicism is the traditional religion of this family of titled gentry. It is as traditional with them as the eighteenth century country house in which they live, the antique furniture in which they delight, or the formalism of the social conventions to which they cling. The argument of the novel implies that, if Catholicism is capable of saving us from the "evils" of the modern world (which is demonstrated in the novel), so is the rest of the tradition, to a greater or lesser degree.

Evelyn Waugh, Scott-King's Modern Europe

In Scott-King's Modern Europe, a satire on modern totalitarianism, there are two central figures: a protagonist, in the character of a "dim" professor of classical studies at a "respectable" English boys' school, whose name appears in the title, and an antagonist in the form of an imaginary modern central European State called Neutralia. Of Scott-King the narrator relates little except that he was

> . . . known to generations of boys first as "Scottie," then of late years, while barely middle-aged, as "old

> Scottie"; a school "institution," whose precise and slightly nasal lamentations of modern decadence were widely parodied. [54]

and that his life work consisted of the translation of the single folio volume containing a poem of some fifteen hundred lines of Latin hexameters by an obscure seventeenth century poet, Bellorius, who had lived in "what was then a happy kingdom of the Habsburg Empire and is now the turbulent modern state of Neutralia."[55]

Much of the novel, however, is concerned with a description of this country to which, in the "austerity" summer of 1946, Scott-King is invited to speak at a tercentenary celebration of his beloved Bellorius. The narrator says that

> . . . for three hundred years . . . Bellorius's . . . country has suffered every conceivable ill the body politic is heir to. Dynastic wars, foreign invasions, disputed successions, revolting colonies, endemic syphilis, impoverished soil, masonic intrigues, revolutions, restorations, cabals, juntas, pronunciamentos, liberations, constitutions, coups d'etat, dictatorships, assassinations, agrarian reforms, popular elections, foreign intervention, repudiation of loans, inflation of currency, trades unions, massacres, arson, atheism, secret societies . . . you will find all these in the last three centuries of Neutralian history. Out of it emerged the present republic of Neutralia, a typical modern state, governed by a single party, acclaiming a dominant Marshal, supporting a vast ill-paid bureaucracy whose work is tempered and humanised by corruption.[56]

Enticed by visions of "garlicky meals washed down by flasks of good red wine," Scott-King accepts the invitation to visit Neutralia, only to find that the celebrations are a

---

[54]Evelyn Waugh, Scott-King's Modern Europe (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1949), p. 3.

[55]Ibid., p. 5. [56]Ibid., p. 6.

hoax perpetrated to get cultured foreigners to endorse the totalitarian government of the country. Half-consciously, out of a sense of gratitude for the free vacation, Scott-King does this, and finds that he is branded, by the other visitors, a "Fascist beast," "Reactionary cannibal," and a "Bourgeois escapist."

Following the ceremonies, Scott-King finds himself ignored by the Neutralian government, unable to get out of the country on any of the conventional means of transportation. He hires an underground agency to help him escape and ends up stark naked in a camp for illegal Jewish immigrants in Israel.

Back at Grandchester school at the end of the summer vacation, Scott-King is informed by the headmaster that fewer boys have enrolled for his classical studies, adding that

> ". . . parents are not interested in producing the 'complete man' any more. They want to qualify their boys for jobs in the modern world. You can hardly blame them, can you?"
> "Oh yes," said Scott-King, "I can and do . . . I think it would be very wicked indeed to do anything to fit a boy for the modern world."
> "It's a short-sighted view, Scott-King."
> "There, headmaster, with all respect, I differ from you profoundly. I think it is the most long-sighted view it is possible to take."[57]

Since, as the novelist points out, this is a "light tale" and a very short one, there is little attempt to develop motivation for Scott-King, except the obvious one of desire to satisfy his passion for Bellorius by a visit to that writer's native country. An abstraction, such as Neutralia, can hardly

---

[57] Ibid., pp. 88-9.

be expected to have any motivation, for it has no behavior. It merely has certain characteristics which are important, among them being the fraudulence which frustrates Scott-King's yearnings for culture. The novelist has gone to great lengths to portray Neutralia as a sort of socialist-fascist dictatorship. For example, a government official escorting Scott-King to the opening ceremonies just after his arrival points out interesting features of the city:

> ". . . Here," he said, "the anarchists shot General Cardenas. Here syndico-radicals shot the auxiliary bishop. Here the Agrarian League buried alive ten Teaching Brothers. Here the bimetallists committed unspeakable atrocities on the wife of Senator Mendoza."[58]

This official comments on the economic status of Neutralia by saying:

> ". . . Your rations in England, your strikes. Here things are very expensive but there is plenty for all who pay, so our people do not strike but work hard to become rich. It is better so, no?"[59]

On his arrival at the Ministry of Rest and Culture, where the preliminaries are to be held, Scott-King observes:

> Like much modern Neutralian building the Ministry was unfinished, but it was conceived in severe one-party style. A portico of unembellished columns, a vast, blank doorway, a bas-relief symbolising Revolution and Youth and Technical Progress and the Neutralian Genius. . .[60]

One of the features of life in this "modern republic" that Scott-King finds most baffling is the high cost of living.

> . . . The prices were fixed, and fixed high, by law; to them were added a series of baffling taxes--30 per cent. for service, 2 per cent. for stamp duty, 30 per cent. for

---

[58]Ibid., pp. 23-4. [59]Ibid., p. 24. [60]Ibid., p.24.

> luxury tax, 5 per cent. for the winter relief fund, 12 per cent. for those mutilated in the revolution, 4 per cent. municipal dues, 2 per cent. federal tax, 8 per cent. for living accommodations in excess of minimum requirements, and others of the same kind; they mounted up . . . beyond the reach of all but foreigners.[61]

He finds it no wonder that Neutralian men "spoke of money and women, dryly and distantly, for they had never had enough of either."[62] In this regard, one sympathetic government worker confides:

> ". . . In Neutralia for a scholar of the first class the salary is 500 ducats a month. The rent of his apartment is perhaps 450 ducats. His taxes are 100. Oil is 30 ducats a litre. Meat is 45 ducats a kilo. So you see, we work."[63]

The determination of this conflict between Scott-King and Neutralia, contained in the closing remarks noted above, is the professor's confirmation of his belief that the modern world is a thoroughly unpleasant place.

Correlations

The significance of the motivations used in the novels discussed in the foregoing sections of this chapter is not apparent without understanding their relation to socialist ideology. Moreover, it is obvious that if any valid generalizations are to be formulated it is necessary to particularize these relationships before attempting to fit them into a pattern of reference.

Accordingly, in the first novel discussed, Elizabeth

---

[61] Ibid., p. 28. [62] Ibid., p. 28. [63] Ibid., p. 34.

Bowen's The Heat of the Day, it was noted that the motivating factor was a desire for security of various sorts. In the case of Harrison this motive offers a patent parallel with socialist theory--the "propertyless proletariat" seeking possession, or material security. Harrison is portrayed as the archetype of this abstraction in the passage in which Stella asks him:

> "Where exactly do you live? I have no idea."
> "There are always two or three places where I can turn in."
> "But for instance, where do you keep your razor?"
> "I have two or three razors," he said in an absent tone.[64]

The implications of this take on added meaning in the light of the fact that Harrison is the antagonist in the novel and his quest for possession of Stella and the "wealth" he thinks she represents is frustrated.

The attempts by Kelway to revolt from middle-class freedom, while cloaked as adherence to Hitlerism, have a marked similarity to Marxian pronouncements. When Kelway says

> "freedom to be what? -- the muddled, mediocre, damned. Good enough to die for freedom, for the good reason that it's the very thing which has made it impossible to live, so there's no alternative. . . . Look at your mass 'free' suckers, your democracy--kidded along from the cradle to the grave . . ."[65]

his statement bears resemblances to this one by Marx:

> In bourgeois society . . . the past dominates the present; in Communist society, the present dominates the past. In bourgeois society capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent

---

[64]Bowen, p. 155. [65]Ibid., p. 302.

and has no individuality.

> And the abolition of this state of things is called by the bourgeois abolition of individuality and freedom! And rightly so. The abolition of bourgeois individuality, bourgeois independence, and bourgeois freedom is undoubtedly aimed at.
>
> By freedom is meant, under the present bourgeois conditions of production, free trade, free selling and buying. . . . This talk about free selling and buying, and all other "brave words" of our bourgeoisie about freedom in general, have a meaning, if any, only in contrast with restricted selling and buying . . .[66]

Kelway's frustration, which leads to his suicide, leaves only Stella and her son, representatives of the landed bourgeoisie, in an advantageous position. From this point of view it seems safe to assume that the novelist is pleading a case for that which the heroine represents.

Ann Bridge's novel, Singing Waters, on the other hand, speaks plainly for itself in the voice of Larsen. His whole argument is, in a sense, anti-socialist. While he agrees to some extent with Marx's "materialistic" concept of history, he eschews the idea of class struggle, and extols the virtues of feudal aristocracy. Like the socialist, he recognizes "evils" in capitalist industrialism in the statement that

> ". . . for almost the whole world today . . . the great problem is how to combine mechanisation on the scale on which we now have it, with the good life."[67]

but, unlike the socialist, he believes that the remedy is to be found in a return to emphasis upon "spiritual" values as opposed to "material" ones. Since these ideas are the ones

---

[66]Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, "The Communist Manifesto," A Handbook of Marxism, ed. Emile Burns (New York: Random House, 1935), pp. 39-40.

[67]Bridge, p. 47.

agreed upon and borne out in the outcome of the story, it is clear that they contain the argument of the novel.

Nor does Graham Greene's The Power and the Glory pose any special problems of interpretation. The "message" of this novel, that socialism (represented by the lieutenant) cannot give more than material comfort to human life whereas religion can provide psychological and spiritual security, is contained in the priest's argument that

> ". . . it's no good your working for your end unless you're a good man yourself. And there won't always be good men in your party. Then you'll have all the old starvation, beating, get-rich-anyhow. But it doesn't matter so much my being a coward--and all the rest. I can put God into a man's mouth just the same--and I can give him God's pardon. It wouldn't make any difference to that if every priest in the Church was like me."[68]

R. C. Hutchinson's Elephant and Castle, however, is not quite so diaphanous or, perhaps because of its complexity, not so superficial in its thesis. Its presentation of London slum conditions comes strikingly close to the Webbs' ideas, that they are

> . . . too bad to have been intentionally brought about by human beings at any stage of civilisation, much less at a period so full of humanitarian and libertarian sentiment and of intelligent progressive aspiration . . .[69]

But the rest of the Fabian doctrine, that these conditions can be alleviated by intellectual social uplifting, does not seem to hold true in this case, for that is what Armorel,

---

[68]Greene, p. 263.

[69]Sidney and Beatrice Webb, The Decay of Capitalist Civilization (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1923), p. 7.

injuriously, tries to do. There is no attempt to make Armorel a representative of socialism, but she does have some of the characteristics generally attributed to it, particularly to so-called "scientific socialism." She is an atheist and a believer that "human nature" is a product of environment and can be changed by changing environment. "It's stupid and reactionary," she says at one point, "to blame people . . . for shortcomings which are no fault of their own."[70]

The argument does not seem to be that Armorel's socialistic desires are wrong, but that the methods she chooses are incorrect. This seems close to Veblen's theory that economic and social inequalities are not erased by forcing the poor to ape the rich. Or to put this same viewpoint in the Marxian context, the proletariat are not to become bourgeois, but the bourgeois must become proletariat. Armorel tries, instead, to raise her husband to her own bourgeois standards, and the story demonstrates that this is unfortunate.

The Fire and the Wood, by the same author, presents a favorable impression of Marxism, at least by comparison with Naziism. This is done by portraying a group of Marxists as people with a most justifiable grievance who are wantonly persecuted by the Nazis. In this episode one of the group asks:

> "D'you remember what happened to the last Marxist that went in front of Drenker Schersking?"
> "That's right . . . the Court's no good. No good

---

[70]Hutchinson, Elephant and Castle, p. 411.

> for a working person. May be all right if you're in a job. No good for a working person if you've not got a job. They come down on you."[71]

This is expanded by showing the pernicious effects of labels as stimuli for persecution in the accusations of "Communist" brought against the hero whose only "Marxian" view is that the individual, not the State, is all-important--a view subscribed to by capitalist as well as socialist.

Another aspect of socialism, that of coercion, is the concern in Huxley's Ape and Essence. The post-atomic society which is portrayed is a coercive society calling itself "proletariat" in the sense that "vox proletariatus, vox Diaboli," and it is the devil who is the deity in this sub-human culture.[72] The manifestations of coercion are in such things as enforced labor and enforced chastity (except for two weeks following Belial Day when free love is permitted). However, some of the "evil" characteristics of present civilization which are pointed out by the Arch-Vicar, in the following, as causes of the atomic deluge are also condemned by socialists:

> ". . . the passage from hunger to imported food, from imported food to booming population, and from booming population back to hunger again. . . . The New Hunger the Higher Hunger, the hunger of enormous industrialized proletariats, the hunger of city dwellers with money, with all the modern conveniences, with cars and radios and every imaginable gadget, the hunger that is the cause of total wars and the total wars that are the cause of yet more hunger."[73]

The Arch-Vicar's vehement condemnation of Marxism by name,

---

[71]Hutchinson, Fire and Wood, p. 123.

[72]Huxley, p. 168.

[73]Ibid., p. 123.

noted in the section dealing with that novel, produces a paradox in which socialism, as a labelled movement, is vitiated, but some of its aspects are presented, by inference at least, as attractive humanitarian alternatives.

Like two of the other novels discussed above, W. Somerset Maugham's The Razor's Edge contains an assertion of the superiority of "spiritual" values over "materialism," which, while it is not antithetical to socialism, is not necessarily favorable to it. Socialism is, at bottom, primarily a philosophy for obtaining the maximum material comfort for the largest possible number of individuals. According to this novel, that is not the most important aspect of human life. This is perhaps best illustrated in the novel in the episode in which Larry, the protagonist, and Isabel first discuss their differences of motives. Isabel begins:

> "Let's be sensible. A man must work, Larry. It's a matter of self-respect. This is a young country and it's a man's duty to take part in its activities. Henry Maturin was saying only the other day that we were beginning an era that would make the accomplishments of the past look like two bits. He said he could see no limit to our progress, and he's convinced that by 1930 we shall be the richest and greatest country in the world . . ."
>
> "I daresay you're right. The Armours and the Swifts will pack more and better meat, the McCormicks will make more and better harvesters, and Henry Ford will turn out more and better cars. And everyone'll get richer and richer."
>
> "And why not?"
>
> "As you say, and why not?" Money just doesn't happen to interest me."[74]

But the materialism which is under attack in this novel is the

---

[74]Maugham, pp. 50-1.

sort in which those who are already materially wealthy seek to make themselves even more wealthy, or at least secure in their wealth. This, of course, is equally condemned by socialist theory.

Little needs to be said about Priestley's Three Men in New Suits except that it is obviously socialist propaganda. The views of Alan and his associates that

> ". . . it's much more important--and much more fun--to create than to possess. It's also much better to live uncomfortably on short rations, as the Russians did, in a society that knows what it's doing and where it's going, than it is to lead a luxurious existence--for a little while--in a society that's wobbling from one disaster to the next. Instead of guessing and gambling, we plan. Instead of competing, we co-operate . . ."[75]

are unmistakably socialistic and can be found, in one form or another, in Marx, Shaw, the Webbs, Wallas, G. D. H. Cole, Wells, John Strachey and many other writers of definitive literature on socialism. The possible point at issue here is the particular kind or quality of socialism espoused. There is no evidence to indicate that it is violently revolutionary in intent. On the contrary, Alan seems to think of socialism more as a philosophy of life than as a program of political action.

Evelyn Waugh's two novels, Brideshead Revisited and Scott-King's Modern Europe, parallel each other in ideation, the former arguing the case for Catholicism, the latter defending classicism, both proposing aspects of traditionalism as

---

[75]Priestley, pp. 214-15.

a panacea for the ills of the modern world. It is not difficult to see that these ideas are intended as an antidote to socialism in Scott-King's Modern Europe since the odious Neutralian government has many of the aspects popularly associated with socialism, or more particularly, with Marxism. Neutralia is characterized as

> ". . . a typical modern state, governed by a single party, acclaiming a dominant Marshal, supporting a vast ill-paid bureaucracy whose work is tempered and humanised by corruption."[76]

The argument for Catholicism, in Brideshead Revisited, is summed up symbolically in the final pages of the novel, in which the narrator reflects upon his knowledge of Brideshead in these words:

> The builders did not know the uses to which their work would descend; they made a new house with the stones of the old castle; year by year, generation after generation, they enriched and extended it; year by year the great harvest of timber in the park grew to ripeness; until, in sudden frost, came the age of Hooper; the place was desolate and the work all brought to nothing; Quomodo sedet sola civitas. Vanity of vanities, all is vanity. . .
>
> Something quite remote from anything the builders intended came out of their work, and out of the fierce little human tragedy in which I played; something none of us thought about at the time; a small red flame--a beaten-copper lamp of deplorable design, relit before the beaten-copper doors of a tabernacle. . . . It could not have been lit but for the builders and the tragedians.[77]

The argument is not so clearly anti-socialist until it is considered in the light of the fact that the Roman Catholic church is, both by nature and pronouncement, opposed to many basic

---

[76]Waugh, Scott-King's Modern Europe, p. 6.

[77]Waugh, Brideshead Revisited, pp. 350-1.

tenets of socialist doctrine generally and it is avowedly at war with Marxism. This has been expressed by a British Catholic writer in the following way:

> . . . Catholics are confronted by the undoubted fact that from time to time the leaders of the Church--popes and bishops--have seen fit to denounce Socialism and denounce it by name . . .
>
> In the first year of his pontificate, Leo XIII issued his Encyclical Concerning Modern Errors: Socialism, Communism, Nihilism. . . . Instances could be multiplied to prove that Socialism has consistently met with ecclesiastical condemnation, papal and episcopal. Though this condemnation is only disciplinary, . . . it conveys the mind of the Church so definitely to its members that Catholics in England as in other parts of the world hesitate to call themselves Socialists even when attracted to some pastel shade of the philosophy which obviously does not fall under the ban.[78]

In the face of this, it seems conclusive that both of Waugh's novels are in essential agreement in denying the validity of socialism.

From the evidence obtained in this study of character motivation, it seems possible to form some preliminary generalizations about the novels being investigated in respect to their relation to socialism. This can best be accomplished by establishing, on the basis of the evidence discussed thus far, the kinds of reactions to socialism exhibited in the novels and the proportions of the various kinds in the total number of novels examined.

It can be said, then, that about half of the novels, four specifically, show a definite antagonism to socialism;

---

[78]Georgiana P. McEntee, The Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927), pp. 100-1.

that is, the characters presented sympathetically in these novels voice or display anti-socialist attitudes. These novels are The Power and the Glory, Ape and Essence, Brideshead Revisited, and Scott-King's Modern Europe. It should be noted, also, that two of this number, The Power and the Glory and Brideshead Revisited, are what may be termed "Catholic" novels, in that they argue a case for that religion in opposition to socialism.

Three of the novels, Elephant and Castle, The Fire and the Wood, and Three Men in New Suits, or approximately one third of the total, contain sympathetically presented characters whose sentiments favor socialism to a positive degree. The remaining three novels, The Heat of the Day, Singing Waters, and The Razor's Edge, display an admixture of judgment in which part of the sympathetic characters show ostensibly socialist motives and attitudes, while other characters exhibit ideations not in agreement with socialism.

The following chapter of this study will attempt to confirm or deny these findings in the light of pertinent information in the novels under examination other than the behavior of the characters.

CHAPTER III

TERMINOLOGY AS EVIDENCE

Perhaps the most patent indication of the "meaning" of a piece of written expression is the language employed in it. To arrive at such an indication of "meaning" involves a problem which, by definition, is semantic. The approach to this problem is to make use of a process of reading which is inductive in nature; that is, the reader, any reader, observes the language symbols which the writer utilizes, evaluates them as to kind, quantity, quality, and their contextual relationship to other language symbols employed, and comes to a conclusion regarding the "meaning" of the expression based upon this evidence.

The subject of this chapter concerns the application of this procedure to the ten novels under consideration in this study. Since it would be an extremely complex task, and not particularly relevant to the purpose of this study, to observe and analyze, in the manner described above, all of the language symbols employed in these novels, it is expeditious that some purposeful selection be employed. Inasmuch as the objective of the present undertaking is to discern the impact of socialism on the novels in question, it is judicious that

investigation be confined to those language symbols which are related in some manner to the general subject of economics and to the more specific one, socialism.

Accordingly, in the course of reading the novels with which this study is concerned, a total of two hundred ninety-seven occurrences of language symbols which are related, in one sense or another, to the subject under discussion were noted together with the immediate contexts in which they were used. Forty-one different terms were noted, as follows:

Wealth, wealthy, rich, property, money, possessions, land, capital, directorship, poor, poverty, slums, hunger, buying, selling, competition, cooperation, collective farms, agricultural cooperative, work, worker, labor, Trade Union, wages, strike, markets, class (and compound forms of it), proletariat, bourgeois, capitalist, aristocracy, Communist (Marxist, etc.), Socialist, Labor party, Conservative, Tory, Bolshevist (and colloquial forms of it), Red (and colloquial forms of it), reactionary, Fascist, and social-democrat.

The reason for selecting these terms to be semantically evaluated is that they seemed to constitute all of the terms employed which appeared to have an important relationship to the subject at hand. Just what this relationship is is the matter for consideration below. However, to simplify the analytical processes these terms have been placed in five semantic categories; that is, for purposes of discussion, all of the language symbols which seemed to be semantically related were

grouped together in a category which represents a sort of common area of meaning. For want of better terms, these five categories have been labelled wealth, poverty, labor, class, and party.

The incidence of the terms in each grouping and their semantic evaluation will be discussed in a separate section of this chapter for each of the five categories. It would be almost superficially facile to be able to refer to an arbiter for an absolute to which the particular usage of the language symbol could be related. To do this, however, does not seem to be possible. The closest approximation to an authority which exists, if it can be accepted as such, is a dictionary. In the field of interest of this study the American dictionaries are not pertinent enough to have value, and the most widely recognized dictionary on British vocabulary, the Oxford New English Dictionary, is hopelessly antedated for this study because of its use of nineteenth century data.

It has been necessary, therefore, to proceed with the utmost caution to evaluate the terms under study only in regard, first, to their immediate contexts and, secondarily, to their larger contexts, the entirety of the novel in which they appear. The problem is to find out how these terms are used in the novels and what significance such usage has in each novel; that is, to discover whether or not the symbol employed is one of approval or disapproval in the novel, and to relate this evidence to the discussion in Chapter II of this study.

The total incidence of categorized occurrences of terms found in the novels is represented numerically in the following table:

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF TERMS, BY CATEGORIES, IN THE NOVELS

The Novels	Wealth	Poverty	Labor	Class	Party	Total
Heat of the Day	4	...	...	3	...	7
Singing Waters	9	3	27	42	2	83
Power & Glory	3	1	...	13	8	25
Elephant & Castle	2	4	3	15	4	28
Fire & the Wood	2	1	1	5	12	21
Ape and Essence	2	7	4	9	11	33
Razor's Edge	10	...	5	16	...	31
Three Men . . .	9	3	24	3	10	49
Brideshead . . .	1	...	2	2	...	5
Scott-King . . .	1	...	5	2	7	15
Total	43	19	71	110	54	297

Wealth

There are forty-three occurrences of language symbols noted in the ten novels under discussion which are related to the concept of wealth. This concept is, of course, a purely subjective phenomenon, a fiction. Because of this fictional nature it cannot be defined with any satisfactory degree of objectivity. For present purposes, however, this concept is extended to cover these symbols employed in the novels: property, money, possessions, land, capital, directorship, and materialism, and compound and derivative forms of these terms.

For example, Elizabeth Bowen, in The Heat of the Day, employs a concept of wealth only four times. In the first three instances, the concept is used in reference to Stella's son's inheritance, of which the narrator says:

> . . . Roderick now owned property he had never seen. Last May, he had inherited from a cousin of his father's a house in the south of Ireland, Mount Morris, with which went about three hundred acres of land. . . . Personally, he had entered into possession the day the effect of the will was made known to him. . . .
>
> Possessorship of Mount Morris affected Roderick strongly. It established for him, and was adding to day by day, what might be called a historic future. The house came out to meet his growing capacity for attachment. . . . The house, nonhuman, became the hub of his imaginary life, of fancies, fantasies only so to be called because the circumstance outlawed them from reality.[1]

In this context the concept of wealth is embodied in the terms property, possession and possessorship. In addition, these terms are connected contextually with the words attachment, historic future, and imaginary life. The wealth in itself, according to this passage, means nothing to Roderick, but has significance in a sort of unreal or imaginary way. This implies that the wealth (property) is not so much an economic thing as a mental or emotional force.

A strikingly similar occurrence is the only other one in this category in the novel. In the description of Mr. Kelway, Robert's deceased father, the narrator says:

> . . . Prestige from his money-making, unspectacular but regular, had been nil; his sex had so lost caste that the very least it could do was to buy tolerance. . . .[2]

---

[1]Bowen, pp. 51-2.

[2]Ibid., pp. 288-9.

Again in this context wealth (money-making) is referred to only in the sense of its subjective importance.

In Singing Waters, Ann Bridge makes eleven uses of terms in this category. The following passage, part of the narration of Larsen's thoughts, is typical of these usages:

> . . . What was vulgarity, anyway? Any form of ostentation, of course; not wealth itself--he remembered the modesty and simplicity of many great American millionaires, like J.P.Morgan, Junior, carrying his cigarettes round in a paper packet--but the display of it, a sort of indecent exposure of wealth. Any form of pretence; the poor or poorer aping the rich, the ill-born giving themselves the airs of the great, typists trying to dress like film stars--oh those cheap high-heeled shoes, the sham jewelry, the greasy hair dress a la Dietrich. . . . Yes, the essence of vulgarity seemed to lie in the pretence at being, or the attempt to be, something that one really was not, with the resulting lack of ease and dignity and taste. Peasants were never vulgar--on the contrary, they had ease and dignity to a high degree. And ease and dignity, though no one praised them in the modern world, were real values, conferring incalculable benefits on their possessors; because they were the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual balance, a poise, a being adjusted to and at home in one's universe, and satisfied with it. Why were people always trying to improve the material conditions of peasants, without giving a thought to what they might be taking away by so doing? Because, he supposed, the modern world, even the humanitarian and philanthropic side of it, thought wholly in material terms.[3]

In this context the novelist has coupled wealth with vulgarity and the indecent exposure of wealth. Contrasted with this are the words ease and dignity as terms of approval in this context. It is obvious that Larsen thinks of material conditions as antitheses of real values. Since this is typical of the eleven occurrences of these terms in the novel,

---

[3]Bridge, pp. 12-13.

it can be said that the writer uses the terms in this category with disapproval. It is noteworthy, also, that wealth is used here in connection with class distinctions. This will be treated more extensively in the section dealing with the "class" category.

Graham Greene uses the concept of wealth, embodied in the word money, three times in The Power and the Glory. For example, in the concluding discussion with the priest, the police lieutenant, a socialist, says:

> ". . . Well, we have ideas too. . . . No more money for saying prayers, no more money for building places to say prayers in. We'll give people food instead, teach them to read, give them books. We'll see they don't suffer."[4]

Later the priest adds: ". . . Hunger can make a man do evil just as much as money can."[5]

A curious opposition between money and hunger, or the lack of food, appears in the above quotations. In the first two instances, money is used in connection with religion, seemingly as an opposite to food and literacy and synonymous with suffering. This attributes the value judgment of "badness" to the idea of money. The third example is an even more obvious association of money with evil, the latter symbol lending an aura of disapproval to the former.

The two usages in this category in Hutchinson's Elephant and Castle indicate that wealth has nothing to do with human beings. The first of these usages is in connection with

---

[4]Greene, pp. 262-3. [5]Ibid., pp. 267-8.

property, the slum property on which Gian and Armorel have their home, and although the word property is not used directly it is implied in this passage in which the narrator explains that Armorel and Gian are unable to deal personally with the persons to whom they owe their rent because

> . . . all that machinery worked from the impetus of periphrastic documents, brown with age, which lay in black tin boxes in the vaults of various banks; it was operated at several points by aged clerks who engrossed abstractions of titles in a spidery hand and by captive youths whose thoughts were on next Saturday's football; and few of the parties concerned knew anything about the others except, in some cases, their names.[6]

In this context wealth, in the form of property, is given a non-human character as machinery, and the last phrase in the quotation tends to expand this idea of the impersonal nature of the machinery of property. It is used neither in a sense of approval nor of disapproval, but merely as being irrelevant to humanity. The second instance of the use of the wealth concept points this up more clearly. Speaking of Armorel's marriage to Gian, Elizabeth says:

> "I doubt if poverty or wealth has anything to do with it. I know a bit about these things. People from the opposite ends of the economic pole can join up and live in perfect contentment. The question always is whether people accept the same fundamentals."[7]

Fundamentals, in this context, are apparently distinguished from wealth, and therefore have nothing to do with economic considerations. Wealth is, then, by inference, only incidental to human life.

---

[6]Hutchinson, Elephant and Castle, p. 230 [7]Ibid., p.310.

Hutchinson employs the idea of wealth again only twice in his The Fire and the Wood. In one context wealth is used in a completely non-economic sense with unusual implications. Professor Rupf, an idealistic scholar, says:

> "Our learning is the greatest wealth we produce, and no one can prevent us from exporting it. Learning and beauty--they are the staples of our national economy."[8]

To this, Herr Barthol replies: "But you can't live without selling something." Since these minor characters were not discussed in Chapter II of this study, it is necessary to explain that Professor Rupf's ideas and motives correspond to those of the protagonist, with whom he is in sympathy, whereas Herr Barthol is representative of the antagonistic Nazi elements. In the light of this, Professor Rupf's idea of wealth becomes a symbol of approval, whereas Herr Barthol's commercialism is disparaged.

Aldous Huxley, in Ape and Essence, uses terms of wealth twice with similar meanings. The following, part of the Arch-Vicar's explanation of World War III, is typical:

> ". . . And then there was Nationalism--the theory that the state you happen to be subject to is the only true god . . . and that every conflict over prestige, power or money is a crusade for the Good, the True and the Beautiful."[9]

This, the Arch-Vicar goes on to say, "is the best proof of Belial's existence." Belial is, of course, synonymous with the word "devil." If conflicts over "power, prestige or money"

---

[8]Hutchinson, The Fire and the Wood., p. 49.

[9]Huxley, pp. 125-6.

are manifestations of the devil, the implication is that they must be evil.

A typical sample of the way in which the concept of wealth, which is embodied in the term money, is handled in The Razor's Edge occurs in a scene in which Larry, the hero, tells the narrator:

> "You attach more importance to money than I do."
> "I can well believe it, . . . You see, you've always had it and I haven't. It's given me what I value almost more than anything else in life--independence. You can't think what a comfort it's been to me to think that if I wanted to I could tell anyone in the world to go to hell."
> "But I don't want to tell anyone in the world to go to hell, and if I did, the lack of a bank balance wouldn't prevent me. You see, money to you means freedom; to me it means bondage."[10]

When Larry, whose ideas are treated sympathetically, couples money with bondage as synonymous ideas, he creates a judgment of disapproval for the former symbol.

The most clearly adverse concept of wealth in the novels studied appears in the nine symbols in this category used in Three Men in New Suits. In one episode in which Alan makes love to Betty Southam, for example, the narrator says that "round them was a garden manured by at least twenty first-class directorships."[11] Wealth, in the form of twenty first-class directorships, is given disapproval by the satiric sense of the figure of speech. Another typical attitude toward wealth in this novel is reflected in this statement by Alan:

". . . but it's when you have property and great possessions

---

[10]Maugham, p. 317. [11]Priestley, p. 118.

> that you learn the habit of looking ahead. Often you plan your life instead of living it. And all the religions seem to have been against that sort of thing."[12]

In this context the opposition between property (and great possessions) and religions is used to create an attitude of disfavor toward wealth.

Only one usage in this category was noted in Brideshead Revisited. In a conversation about the narrator's allowance while at Oxford, his father tells him:

> ". . . my recollection is that nowhere else in the world and at no other time, do a few hundred pounds, one way or the other, make so much difference to one's importance and popularity."[13]

In this context, wealth, a few hundred pounds, is tied up with the idea of individual importance, or as a measure of the worth of a human being. This denotes a certain respect for wealth, a placing of value upon it.

Waugh again employs only one usage in this category in Scott-King's Modern Europe. The novelist says of the Neutralian men that "they spoke of money and women, dryly and distantly, for they had never had enough of either."[14] Since Neutralia is the antagonist of the novel, a "bad" symbol of the modern world, this lack of money could hardly be construed as anything but a bad situation. Therefore, consistently with the usage in Brideshead Revisited, wealth is used with approval.

---

[12]Ibid., p. 87. [13]Waugh, Brideshead Revisited, p.25.

[14]Waugh, Scott-King's Modern Europe, p. 28.

In sum, it can be said that a large majority of the novels contain symbols of wealth used as symbols of disapproval. This is true in the case of the novels by Bowen, Bridge, Greene, Huxley, Maugham and Priestley. In both of his novels Hutchinson sees wealth as irrelevant to human life, which is not an indication of approval. Waugh alone finds it important and gives it approval. These findings are at variance with those in Chapter II in that the idea of the "badness" of wealth is held by both proponents and opponents of socialism. The socialist attitude toward wealth, as an accumulation of material things, is exemplified in this pronouncement of Shaw:

> Some people imagine that because they can save money the wealth of the world can be stored up. Stuff and nonsense. Most of the wealth that keeps us alive will not last a week. . . . A nation which stopped working would be dead in a fortnight even if every man, woman, and child in it had houses and lands and a million of money in the savings bank.[15]

In this, as well as in similar dicta by Marx, the Webbs, and others, it is evident that the socialist is not opposed to wealth _per se_, but to the concentration of it. He feels that work is essential and wealth is not fundamental. A suggestion of this attitude is reflected in the novels by Bowen, Bridge, Greene and Huxley, all of whom, it was pointed out in the preceding chapter of this study, are opposed, at least in part, to socialism. Only Waugh, among those who have been seen to be anti-socialist in the evidence discussed in Chapter II, uses

---

[15]Bernard Shaw, _The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism_ (New York: Brentano's, 1928), p. 6.

non-socialist ideas about wealth.

Poverty

Closely related to the concept of wealth, perhaps a part of it in one philosophic sense, is that of poverty, or the lack or absence of wealth. It seems significant, at the outset, that there are only half as many usages pertinent to this concept in the novels as there are those related to the concept of wealth. In fact, four of the novels contain no noticeable references to poverty and the others do not contain them in any quantity. Language symbols placed in this category include poverty, slum, and hunger (used in a physical sense).

Symbols of this group appear three times in Singing Waters, in the form of the term slum. The following is a typical example, extracted from Larsen's conversation with Gloire in the closing chapters of the novel:

> ". . . Britain is now trying to coax her people back onto the land; then why take them off it here? These people's houses are rough, but they are not slums, and there is no slum mentality--there are no bums and hobos in the Balkans. Everyone knows where he belongs."[16]

The implication in this context is that slums are "bad" and that to take people off the land is to create slums, a theory which is consistent with Larsen's avowed "anti-mechanization." This same idea is, perhaps, even more clearly set forth in the earlier parts of the book in a passage of narration of

---

[16]Bridge, p. 257.

Larsen's thoughts, as follows:

> Why, he asked himself again, remembering Milan through which he had just passed, and its factories and slums--why had the artisans in large towns so much less ease and dignity than peasants? . . .[17]

The context for the usage of the symbol of poverty which appears in The Power and the Glory has already been quoted in the immediately preceding section of this chapter. In it the idea of poverty, in the use of the term hunger in connection with the "poor" class, is pointed out as "evil," as evil, in fact, as the idea of wealth which is contained in the same sentence.

One of the four usages in this category in Elephant and Castle has also been quoted in the immediately preceding section of this chapter. In that instance poverty is given the suggestion of disapproval by the implication that it does not contribute to human happiness. The following is another context in the same novel in which poverty is used as a symbol of disapprobation:

> . . . Those loiterers with their effluvium of scent and poverty brought whiffs of the reality he had been steering away from all these years.[18]

The narrator is speaking here about Raymond, the dilettante aristocrat, and the connection of poverty with symbols of unpleasant smells gives it an unpleasant connotation. A further implication is that poverty is reality, whereas Raymond's

---

[17]Ibid., p. 12.

[18]Hutchinson, Elephant and Castle, p. 309.

aristocratic life is not. This idea is brought out again in another context in which Armorel's daughter, Antonia, speaks sarcastically of one of her mother's fellow social workers:

> ". . . And she tells people who are poor that the great thing is to cultivate a healthy attitude toward poverty, and then stands there radiating healthy attitudes until her Lagonda sweeps her off to the Mirabelle."[19]

It aids the understanding of this context to know that "the Mirabelle" is an exclusive and expensive dinner club in London.

In The Fire and the Wood there is a clear statement that poverty is pernicious, especially in relation to the protagonist, Zepichmann. The narrator says that "the shape of poverty, to one a fraction past its margin, was in a peculiar way offensive."[20] To the central character, then, poverty is offensive, and his are the views that receive the major attention and sympathy in the novel.

The seven uses of symbols in this category in Ape and Essence refer to poverty in the sense, possibly, of physical hunger, which, in the words of the Arch-Vicar, was a contributing cause to the destruction of modern society. He calls it:

> ". . . the passage from hunger to imported food, from imported food to booming population, and from booming population back to hunger again. . . . The New Hunger, the Higher Hunger, the hunger of enormous industrialized proletariats, the hunger of city dwellers with money, with all the modern conveniences, with cars and radios and every conceivable gadget, the hunger that is the cause of total wars and the total wars that are the cause of yet more hunger."[21]

---

[19] Ibid., p. 498.

[20] Hutchinson, The Fire and the Wood, p. 79.

[21] Huxley, p. 123.

This is intended not as a description of the state of the world in 1948 but as a prophecy of what the near future holds in store, since the Arch-Vicar is speaking as a person looking back on the present from a vantage point in the twenty-second century. Poverty, then, or hunger is, by the Arch-Vicar's pronouncement, one of the essential ills of modern civilization and the implication is that it must be corrected if the modern world is to avoid destruction.

In one of the three uses of symbols in this category in Three Men in New Suits is a clear-cut statement that poverty is bad and the world must be rid of it. Alan says:

> ". . . There's something in us now that will not rest nor find any lasting satisfaction while most human beings still exist in poverty, ignorance and despair."[22]

The idea that most human beings are poverty-stricken is, of course, a restatement of socialist ideology--the idea of the "wage slave" or the "possessionless proletariat."

From the foregoing discussion it is evident that, in all of the novels containing language symbols of poverty, these symbols are used as terms of opprobrium. This, together with the numerical sparseness of such symbols and their complete absence in a large proportion of the novels, seems to indicate a general distaste for the idea of poverty which, while it is not the exclusive property of socialism, is, nevertheless, one of the bases of socialist philosophy.

---

[22]Priestley, p. 216.

Labor

The use of language symbols related to the concept of labor constitutes, next to those in the class group to be discussed hereafter, the largest number of terms noted in this investigation of terminology. The importance of this category of terms for this particular study is inherent in the importance of the concept of labor in socialist philosophy. Karl Marx's theory of value, in which labor alone confers value to things, which is more or less subscribed to by a majority of doctrinaire socialists, is a basic tenet of socialist ideology.

This category has been so constituted as to include what are actually two concepts: the concept of labor as a human operation, work, and the economic concept of the production and distribution of goods and services. Though these concepts differ, they are integrated in thought in such a way that it is difficult to separate them. The distinction between them, however, will be preserved throughout the following discussion. The terms noted comprising this category include work, buying, selling, competition, cooperation, agricultural cooperative, collective farm, machines, trade union, wages, strike, markets and, in a very few instances, words referring to specific kinds of labor.

There are thirty-two references to various concepts of labor in Singing Waters. Perhaps the most obvious occurrence of the idea of labor as a human operation is the following,

which is extracted from Larsen's dialogue with Gloire:

> "In Europe we don't think labour a hardship in itself; only excessive labour. In fact we are more positive; we know, and have retained our knowledge, that working with the hands is a good thing for anyone--it confers virtue and power."[23]

Later he talks about

> ". . . the power of English Trade Unions and their sense of political responsibility. It all goes so smoothly, with so much good will and mutual self-respect. There is nothing like it in the world--certainly there is nothing like it in America as yet . . ."[24]

What could be more obvious expressions of approval of labor as a human operation and of the British Labor party?

In its economic sense, labor is treated by Larsen in a somewhat different way:

> "It is America which will not let the world alone, which holds up its way of life as the ideal for every nation, and seeks to impose its own standard of living--which many people think ridiculously and unwholesomely high--on others, partly of course in the search for markets. If it were openly stated that it was just a search for markets, that would be one thing, but it is not; by a tremendous propaganda campaign this materialistic conception is held up as an ideal, as somehow a part of liberty, and above all, as a form of happiness. To search for markets is legitimate, but to make a virtue of so doing is not. Most of all it is a crime to dress up salesmanship in the garments of philanthropy, and to try to drag spiritual values into advertising. . . . I'm not really anti-American at all, only anti-mechanisation--because I think that mechanisation, pushed beyond a certain point, is bad."[25]

The significance of this passage lies in the similarity of Larsen's views of the search for markets to those of Karl Marx. To the latter this was one of the iniquitous features of

---

[23]Bridge, p. 21. [24]Ibid., p. 22. [25]Ibid., p. 50.

capitalism, and Larsen says that it cannot, or should not, be made a virtue. His statement that he is "anti-mechanization" bears out his expression, noted in the preceding context, of approval of labor in the sense of "working with the hands."

Hutchinson, in Elephant and Castle, uses symbols in this category three times. One is in a reference to "the newspapers black with unreasonable discontents, everybody wanting more wages or more colonies . . ."[26] This occurrence is in a narrative passage and, by connecting the terms black and wages with the connotation of "greed" in the terms more colonies, indicates disapproval of the idea of wages.

In another context in this novel the idea of labor as work is given, again, unfavorable signification. Michael answers Antonia's query about his plans for the future with:

> "The future? That's just a gag which the old use to get more work out of the young; the gorgeous future with aeroplanes doing a thousand miles an hour and a radiogram in every home and free vitamins for everyone on Boxing Day."[27]

The single use of symbols in this category in The Fire and the Wood has already been noted in the category dealing with concepts of wealth. The symbol which occurs is the word selling and, as noted in the category in which the context was quoted, it is used with disapproval in an ironic sense.

The four uses of symbols in this classification in Ape

---

[26]Hutchinson, Elephant and Castle, p. 311.

[27]Ibid., p. 501.

and Essence refer to labor as a human operation. A typical example of this is in this statement, again in the dialogue of Dr. Poole and the Arch-Vicar, in the words of the latter:

> "Needless to say nobody ever gets anything for nothing. God's bounties have their price, and Belial always sees that it's a stiff one. Take those machines, for example. Belial knew perfectly well that, in finding a little alleviation from toil, flesh would be subordinated to iron and mind would be made the slave of wheels. He knew that if a machine is foolproof it must also be skillproof, talentproof, inspirationproof. . . ."[28]

The judgment here is that machines, as tools of labor, are bad because of their non-human character. This parallels the Marxian concept that civilization must either control the machine, or mechanization, or it will be controlled by it.

In The Razor's Edge a fine distinction is made between kinds of human labor. For example, the protagonist, Larry, takes a job as a coal miner and another as an itinerant farm laborer in France and Germany during his quest for mystical philosophy and ends by deciding to be a mechanic and taxi-driver in America. This, apparently, is approved. However, in Larry's conversation with Isabel, she tells him:

> "Larry, if you hadn't a cent to your name and got a job that brought you in three thousand a year I'd marry you without a minute's hesitation. I'd cook for you, I'd make the beds, I wouldn't care what I wore, I'd go without anything, I'd look upon it as wonderful fun, because I'd know that it was only a question of time and you'd make good. But this means living in a sordid beastly way all our lives with nothing to look forward to. It means that I should be a drudge to the day of my death. And for what? So that you can spend years trying to find answers to questions that you say yourself

---

[28]Huxley, p. 121.

> are insoluble. It's so wrong. A man ought to work. That's what he's here for. That's how he contributes to the welfare of the community."[29]

Larry replies sarcastically with:

> "In short it's his duty to settle down in Chicago and enter Henry Maturin's business. Do you think that by getting my friends to buy the securities that Henry Maturin is interested in I should add greatly to the welfare of the community?"[30]

There appears, in this context, a judgment against the idea of labor in the form of selling securities since, by Larry's implication, it does not "contribute to the welfare of the community."

A large proportion of the twenty-four occurrences of symbols of labor in Three Men in New Suits, the largest number of occurrences in this category in any of the novels, consists of the term work contextually connected with the term together, which denotes the idea of cooperative labor. Typical of this usage is Alan's statement that

> "If we can work together to destroy and kill, then surely to God we can work together to build up and to create new life. . ."[31]

The virtue of cooperation is extolled again by Alan in another context, as follows:

> ". . . We try to remember that it's much more important --and much more fun--to create than to possess. . . . Instead of guessing and gambling, we plan. Instead of competing, we co-operate. . ."[32]

The unmistakable marks of socialism in this context need no

---

[29]Maugham, p. 78. [30]Ibid., p. 79.

[31]Priestley, p. 213. [32]Ibid., pp. 214-15.

explanation. This sort of judgment is extended in such passages as the following, spoken by Herbert Kenford:

> ". . . Farming is what I know, so I'd like to do that, but I don't care whether I run my own farm or join with other chaps in some sort of agricultural cooperative, or go and work on a collective farm, Russian style."[33]

The only uses of labor symbols in Brideshead Revisited are in reference to the General Strike of 1926. In a report statement, the narrator says, "I returned to London in the spring of 1926 for the General Strike."[34] In a succeeding passage he states that he had anticipated the situation as

> . . . a clear, composite picture of Revolution--the red flag on the post office, the overturned tram, the drunken N.C.O.'s, the gaol open and gangs of released criminals prowling the streets, the train from the capital that did not arrive. . .[35]

This situation, he continues, turns out to be purely imaginary. The strike is of no importance at all. His father tells him:

> "You've come at a very awkward time, you know. They're having another of those strikes in two days--such a lot of nonsense . . ."[36]

With this the idea of the strike, which is a phenomenon concomitant with the idea of labor, is dismissed as nonsense. This is consistent with the points of view of this author which have already been noted.

The same symbol occurs in a different context in Scott-King's Modern Europe. A Neutralian government official chides

---

[33] Ibid., p. 201.

[34] Waugh, Brideshead Revisited, p. 200.

[35] Ibid., p. 201.

[36] Ibid., p. 202.

Scott-King about

> ". . . your rations in England, your strikes. Here things are very expensive but there is plenty for all who pay, so our people do not strike but work hard to become rich. It is better so, no?"[37]

According to the argument of the novel, nothing in Neutralia is "better," since that country is a socialist-fascist dictatorship; so, by a curious contrast, the strikes in England are, possibly, approved, or at least shown to be the lesser of two evils!

The largest proportion of the language symbols in the novels relating to the concept of labor in an economic sense are used as terms of disapproval, although those symbols pertaining to labor as a human operation are used with approval. The only novel which actually uses terms of the latter concept with disapproval is The Razor's Edge, while Waugh's two novels give the subject only cursory treatment. In the main, the uses of these symbols in the novels bear a distinct parallel to parts of Marx's "materialistic concept of history," in which he says:

> . . . The growing competition among the bourgeois, and the resulting commercial crisis, makes the wages of the workers ever more fluctuating. The unceasing improvements in machinery, ever more rapidly developing, makes their livelihood more and more precarious; the collisions between individual workmen and individual bourgeois take more and more the character of collisions between two classes. Thereupon the workers begin to form combinations (trades' unions) against the bourgeois . . .[38]

---

[37]Waugh, Scott-King's Modern Europe, p. 24.

[38]Marx and Engels, . . . A Handbook of Marxism, p. 32.

Class

Aside from being the most frequently used category in the novels under the study, this is perhaps the most important group of terms and the one which most deserve careful attention because of its fundamental position in socialist doctrine. While not all socialists accept without reservation Marx's "dialectical concept of history," in which the theory of class struggle is the dominant feature, most of them use the language symbols of this theory, bourgeois and proletariat, extensively. In essence, the concept of economic classes can be said to be socialistic. The very prevalence of language symbols of class in the novels, a total of one hundred ten occurrences, would tend to indicate some measure of socialist influence.

In The Heat of the Day, the novelist states that Kelway is a member of the "middle class." She speaks of his home in the country as "conceived to please and appease middle-class ladies."[39] Then, in Kelway's confession of treason to Stella, he says that he is part of

> ". . . a class without a middle, a race without a country. Unwhole. Never earthed in--and there are thousands of thousands of us, and we're still breeding . . ."[40]

In this context the middle class is, by implication, denounced. However, it must be remembered that this is said by a man who is a traitor, an antagonist, and therefore it is not entirely

---

[39]Bowen, p. 307. [40]Ibid., p. 289.

an expression of disfavor for that class.

Novelist Bridge employs forty-two language symbols in this category in Singing Waters. One instance, in a narrative portion of the novel, contains this rather unusual class distinction:

> . . . She belonged obviously to a good, as well as to the merely expensive class; her pearls were real, so were the diamonds on her breast and her left wrist . . .[41]

The idea of class, in this context, is related to objects of wealth not with any obvious disfavor.

Another instance, in the same novel, pertains to the idea of equality in class. When Gloire tells Larsen that "there is something in equality," he replies:

> "There is something . . . but one wants to be quite clear which forms of equality are real and possible, and which are not. There can be, and should be, absolute equality before the law."[42]

This statement is the outcome of the conversation between the two central characters in which Gloire says, "we want to eliminate bums," to which Larsen retorts:

> "Admirable. But you have not eliminated them--not only so, but the modern trend is to increase rapidly and steadily the class from which they chiefly spring, what Rebecca West calls 'the mindless, traditionless, possessionless urban proletariat.' And you pretend that they are equals of these others. That is a doctrinaire falsehood, and the stockbreeder knows it."
>
> "You really believe in aristocracy then?"
>
> "Certainly. I do not see how a sensible man who has been in contact with it, can do otherwise."[43]

This justification of inequality of class and that of aristocracy

---

[41]Bridge, p. 7. [42]Ibid., p. 40.

[43]Ibid., pp. 38-9.

on genetic grounds, while the term proletariat, identified in meaning with bums, is used with disapproval, is typical of the tone of the class symbols used throughout this novel.

Although the terms of class which are used in The Power and the Glory are given economic significations, the rich and the poor, the landlord and the peasant, Marxian class symbols do not appear in the novel. In one context the police lieutenant asks the priest

> ". . . what have you ever done in Mexico for us? Have you ever told a landlord he shouldn't beat his peon--oh, yes, I know, in the confessional perhaps, and it's your duty, isn't it, to forget it at once? You come out and have dinner with him and it's your duty not to know that he has murdered a peasant."[44]

The police lieutenant refers to the landlord class in disparagement, but this officer is portrayed as a fanatical socialist. However, the priest, the protagonist, holds a similar view in his statement that "we've always said the poor are blessed and the rich are going to find it hard to get into heaven."[45] The priest, of course, represents a religious viewpoint in the matter of class, but the total effect of the lieutenant's and the priest's statements is to give the term rich an opprobrious aura while the term poor is given approval.

Marxian class terminology constitutes by far the largest proportion of the occurrences of symbols of class in Elephant and Castle. For example, one of Armorel's friends says

---

[44]Greene, p. 261. [45]Ibid., p. 268.

of her: "She was so absolutely honest, in the real sense, not just the bourgeois one."[46] This implies that bourgeois honesty is not genuine. In another passage, Antonia refers to one of the minor characters as "that man Gray--spittle and bunkum! Bourgeois! Atavistic poppycock!"[47] In this context bourgeois is obviously a term of disapprobation. An interesting occurrence of the class idea in this novel is in the statement of Gian, a laborer, about his neighbors:

> ". . . Get y'down, this street? I know, bung up with nothin' but perishin' proletariat, lot of nosey-parkin' ole girls want to know which way up you put on your undies an' all."[48]

Proletariat is used here with obvious disapproval or perhaps in a comic sense on the part of Gian, who could qualify for the label himself.

In The Fire and the Wood there are no Marxian class terms, but symbols of class are handled in it in much the same way as in Hutchinson's other novel, discussed immediately above. The villain of the story is a member of the Junker class, the aristocracy of Germany, and in a conversation in which the hero discusses with another doctor the refusal of the hospital director to admit charity patients, he says:

> "I imagine it would be a question of capital."
> "Exactly, yes, capital! If there were two hundred wealthy Junkers on the waiting-list, d'you suppose Wildelau would simply tell 'em the ward was full?"[49]

---

[46]Hutchinson, Elephant and Castle, p. 498.

[47]Ibid., p. 499. [48]Ibid., p. 431.

[49]Hutchinson, The Fire and the Wood, p. 119.

In this usage the term wealthy Junker becomes a symbol of disapproval. On the other hand, one of the minor characters observes that

> ". . . the Court's no good. No good for a working person. May be all right if you're in a job. No good for a working person if you've not got a job. They come down on you."[50]

The idea of the "oppression" of the working person, suggested in this context, is one of disapproval. By opposition, then, working person must be a symbol of approval.

Marxian symbols of class abound in Ape and Essence. Of the nine occurrences of class symbols noted in this novel, six were Marxian terms, of which proletariat was the most numerous. The attitude toward this term in the novel is best displayed in the following extract:

> "You seem to forget that this is a Democracy."
> "A Democracy in which every proletarian enjoys perfect freedom."
> "True freedom."
> "Freely doing the will of the Proletariat."
> "And vox proletariatus, vox Diaboli."
> "While, of course, vox Diaboli, vox Ecclesiae."
> "And we here are the Church's representatives."
> "So you see."
> "But I'm tired of cemeteries. I'd like to dig up live things for a change."
> "Correct me if I'm wrong. But my impression is that any vessel [woman] rejecting Proletarian liberty is liable to twenty-five lashes for each and every offence."[51]

The fact that rejecting Proletarian liberty makes one liable to punishment suggests that "proletarian" liberty is not liberty at all but actually the opposite of liberty, slavery.

---

[50] Ibid., p. 123. [51] Huxley, p. 168.

This implies a judgment of disapproval of proletarian liberty.

Although no Marxian class symbols are employed in The Razor's Edge, there are frequent occurrences of such terms as upper class, middle class and working class. One such usage appears in this statement by Elliott Templeton, a comic "snob" character:

> "Society is dead. At one time I had hopes that America would take the place of Europe and create an aristocracy that the hoi polloi would respect, but the depression destroyed any chance of that. My poor country is becoming hopelessly middle-class. You wouldn't believe it, my dear fellow, but last time I was in America a taxi driver addressed me as brother."[52]

This passage has significance in its comic sense. Elliott's indignation at the state of affairs he describes is intended to be amusing and, therefore, is not seriously acceptable as a statement of disapproval.

In another instance in this novel, Larry says of the tragic Sophie:

> "She'd read a lot about the condition of the working classes and she'd seen something of it for herself in Chicago. She'd got on to Carl Sandburg and was writing savagely in free verse about the misery of the poor and the exploitation of the working classes. I daresay it was rather commonplace, but it was sincere and it had pity in it and aspiration. At that time she wanted to become a social worker. It was moving, her desire for sacrifice. I think she was capable of a great deal."[53]

The interpretation of this context hinges on the fact that Sophie, a minor character, is presented sympathetically and tragically in the novel. This sympathy, particularly from

---

[52]Maugham, p. 222. [53]Ibid., p. 219.

Larry, is transferred to her concern for the working classes, which is given approval.

The only sense in which a class symbol is used in Three Men in New Suits is in reference to the upper economic class. Thus, Alan speaks of his family in the following way:

> "The class they belong to, their kind of society, is simply dropping to pieces. They're all at the end of little blind alleys. They all accuse each other of being barmy--and they're right. There isn't anything more for them to do as a special class, but they can't--or won't --come out into the main road with the crowd and go somewhere."[54]

The statement that the class his family belongs to, the upper class, is barmy (crazy) is an obvious display of unfavorable judgment for that class.

The two references to class in Brideshead Revisited pertain to the lower economic class. In one passage in the novel, the narrator, describing his days at Oxford, says:

> . . . My earliest friends fitted well into this background; they were . . . a small circle of college intellectuals, who maintained a middle course of culture between the flamboyant "aesthetes" and the proletarian scholars who scrambled fiercely for facts in the lodging houses of the Iffley Road and Wellington Square.[55]

The point of interest in this context is the fact that the novelist, eschewing Marxian class symbols elsewhere in the novel, uses the term proletarian here as an opposite of "aesthetes." There is an indication here that these two terms refer to extremes with which the narrator is not in agreement,

---

[54]Priestley, p. 204.

[55]Waugh, Brideshead Revisited, p. 27.

or which he regards with disfavor. In another instance in this novel, the narrator's father tells him:

> ". . . I wanted to talk about Etruscan notions of immortality; he wanted to talk about extension lectures for the working class; so we compromised and talked about you."[56]

This indicates that the working class is not an approved subject of conversation with the father, whose views are presented rather sympathetically.

A Marxian class symbol occurs again in Scott-King's Modern Europe, by the same author. When Scott-King displeases his fellow scholars by being duped into endorsing the Neutralian regime, the author says that "strong words were used of him. 'Fascist beast,'--'Reactionary cannibal,'--'Bourgeois escapist'."[57] The statement that bourgeois is a strong word is not borne out simply by its being used on Scott-King. This seems to indicate that it is intended satirically, and the anti-climax shows that the satire is intended on the scholars as well as on Neutralia itself.

In all of the contexts quoted in the discussion of this category of terms, language symbols which refer to class are used in an economic sense. Not only is this significant, but it also takes on greater meaning in view of the large use of Marxian class symbols in these novels. This is true even in the novels which indicated an opposition to socialism in the evidence discussed in Chapter II of this study, which seems to

---

[56] Ibid., p. 25.

[57] Waugh, Scott-King's Modern Europe, p. 60.

evidence some socialist influence in regard to the concept of class even in those novels. Also, in the fact that in Hutchinson's The Fire and the Wood, written in 1940, there occur no Marxian class symbols, whereas in his Elephant and Castle these symbols are used profusely, there is evidence that some influence has been operating during the eight years' interim which caused such a marked change in usage.

Party

This category has been designated by the word party in order to signify a group of language symbols which are used in reference to organizations, individuals (by organizational names), and schools of politico-economic thought. A total of fifty-four occurrences of the following terms were placed in this group: Communist, Marx(and derivatives of this name), Socialist, Labor party, Conservative, Tory, Bolshie (a colloquial form of Bolshevist), Red Shirt, Red, reactionary, Fascist, social-democrat, and party.

The word reactionary, for example, occurs twice in Singing Waters to indicate an economic and political viewpoint. It is used by Gloire, the central character, as a derisive term, indicating disapproval. When Larsen tells her his views on aristocracy, the narrator says: "She laughed a little. 'You are a reactionary!'."[58]

All of the references to party in The Power and the

---

[58]Bridge, p. 42.

Glory are terms used to indicate the socialists, who are called Red Shirts, a fictitious Mexican political party. One example of this is in a dialogue between the priest and a minor character, the dentist, who says:

> "You remember this place before--before the Red Shirts came?"
> "I suppose I do."
> "How happy it was then."
> "Was it? I didn't notice."
> "They had at any rate--God."[59]

The possibly ironical implication in this context is that the Red Shirts are responsible for the lack of happiness in the state of affairs existing at the time the dialogue takes place, and therefore are not approved. In another passage the priest tells the Red Shirt lieutenant:

> ". . . there won't always be good men in your party. . . . But it doesn't matter so much my being a coward--and all the rest. I can put God into a man's mouth just the same --and I can give him God's pardon."[60]

This indicates that socialism, your party, because of human frailties, cannot compare favorably with the church, which transcends human frailty.

One of the symbols in this category is to be found in Elephant and Castle in Armorel's statement that

> ". . . it's stupid and reactionary to blame people, especially children, for shortcomings which are no fault of their own."[61]

The disapprobation of reactionary by making it synonymous with

---

[59]Greene, p. 20. [60]Ibid., pp. 262-3.

[61]Hutchinson, Elephant and Castle, p. 411.

stupid is obvious. There is evidence here, also, that Armorel regards any disagreement with her environmentalist point of view as reactionary instead of "different" or "radical."

The only reference in the novels studied to the British Conservative party by that name is also in Elephant and Castle. One of Gian's slum friends tells Trevon:

> "I'll tell you what I'd do with Conservatives--friends of yourn or not, Bulky--I'd stand 'em in one long row on Tower Bridge there and jack up the bascles, I mean that."[62]

Conservative in this context is obviously a term of disfavor, and no attempt is made in this or succeeding passages in the novel to modify this expression of attitude.

The terms Communist and Marxist appear ten times in The Fire and the Wood. The protagonist is accused, falsely, of being a Communist, and the minor characters tend to blame all of their troubles, incorrectly it is inferred, on the Communists. This is pointed out in the following:

> ". . . they fix it up with the Communists. It suits their book, you see, to keep us a beaten country. Suits the social-democrats too . . ."[63]

These words are spoken by Herr Barthol, who is a comic character, an object of satire, in the novel. Herr Barthol uses the terms Communist and social-democrat with disfavor, but the story shows him to be a pawn of the Nazis, who are the antagnists. The term Marxist occurs in a later passage in which some workers, who have been mistreated and injured by their

---

[62]Ibid., p. 344.

[63]Hutchinson, The Fire and the Wood, p. 48.

employers, are advised by the hero to sue for damages. One of the group replies:

> "Damages? . . . Damages! With Drenker-Schersking on the Bench? D'you remember what happened to the last Marxist that went in front of Drenker-Schersking?"[64]

The implication in this passage is that Marxists are unjustly persecuted. This suggests sympathy for the Marxists, at least on this score.

There are nearly as many references to Communism in Ape and Essence as there are in the novel just discussed. Communism and Fascism are pointed out by the Arch-Vicar as agents in the destruction of modern civilization because they were inspired by Belial. Speaking of twentieth century humanity, he says:

> ". . . the Belial in them wanted the Communist Revolution, wanted the Fascist reaction to that revolution, wanted Mussolini and Hitler and the Politburo, wanted famine, inflation and depression; wanted armaments as a cure for unemployment . . ."[65]

This judgment of disapproval against Communism occurs again, perhaps even more clearly, in Dr. Poole's answer to the Arch-Vicar:

> ". . . I liked what you said about the contacts between East and West--how He persuaded each side to take only the worst the other had to offer. So the East takes Western nationalism, Western armaments, Western movies, and Western Marxism; the West takes Eastern despotism, Eastern superstitions and Eastern indifference to individual life. In a word, He saw to it that mankind should make the worst of both worlds."[66]

---

[64] Ibid., p. 123.

[65] Huxley, p. 129.

[66] Ibid., p. 184.

In Three Men in New Suits one of the protagonists, Herbert Kenford, defends the "Reds" against a statement of disparagement by Colonel Southam, who ways: ". . . Packs of Reds all over the place. Can't have that here, can we?"[67] Herbert replies:

> ". . . A lot of places I've been in, the people you call Reds took over because they were the people who'd been against the Nazis all the time--see? And the other sort of people, who were frightened of the Reds, had been collaborating with the Nazis--so they were out."[68]

In the same novel there is a reference to the British Conservative party in the form of the term Tory, used with disfavor by Doris Morgan, a sympathetic character, in the following:

> "Mrs. Thompson thinks that if she doesn't put that silly old Tory back in Parliament, then everything will be divided up and probably Mrs. Flanagan next-door will get one of her two pink vases."[69]

Also in this novel is the only direct reference to the British Labor party which occurs in the novels under investigation. Markinch, the henchman of the tycoon who offers Alan a job, says:

> "I was born in Liverpool . . . not far from Scotland Road. Tough slum. Left school at thirteen. And then these belly-aching Labour men say you can't get on in this country unless you come out of the top drawer. Look at me. Bottom drawer."[70]

The term Labour, referring to the political party, is obviously one of repugnance to Markinch. But his argument is destroyed when he says "Look at me," since he is portayed in the novel as the most ruthless kind of business man.

---

[67]Priestley, p. 49. [68]Ibid. [69]Ibid., p. 143.

[70]Ibid., p. 105.

Neutralia is described in Scott-King's Modern Europe as a "one-party" State. The name of the party is not given, but recent history indicates that "one-party" States are generally either Communist or Fascist countries. If Neutralia is either Communist or Fascist, these parties are given disapproval, for the whole impression created in the novel is that Neutralia is an unpleasant place, at least in the eyes of the hero. The narrator says that Neutralia is

> . . . a typical modern state, governed by a single party, acclaiming a dominant Marshal, supporting a vast ill-paid bureaucracy whose work is tempered and humanised by corruption.[71]

In another passage the narrator describes a Neutralian government building as "conceived in severe one-party style."[72]

There is a slight indication, however, that the Neutralian ruling party is not "red" in the explanation of one of Scott-King's fellow scholars of how he chanced to be chosen to visit Neutralia. He says: "They tried the Professor of Latin. He's red. Then they asked for anyone to represent the University."[73] It is noteworthy, also, that the term red is used in this context as one of disfavor.

The foregoing discussion of uses in the novels of language symbols of party indicates that the use of these terms is essentially consistent with the character motivations discussed in the preceding chapter of this study. It is also

---

[71]Waugh, Scott-King's Modern Europe, p. 6.

[72]Ibid., p. 17. [73]Ibid., p. 24.

significant that the term reactionary, which is one of frequent socialist usage, is used as a symbol of disapproval, while the term radical does not occur in the novels. Apparently no political or economic group talked about in the novels is considered radical, but all are accepted as normal and usual. The idea of party seems, by the evidence noted, to be generally accepted in these novels, but the majority of the symbols used in this connection are used with disfavor.

The following table represents numerically the evidence discussed in this chapter:

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF SYMBOLS OF APPROVAL AND DISAPPROVAL, BY CATEGORIES, IN THE NOVELS

Categories	Approved	Disapproved	Total
Wealth	5	38	43
Poverty	...	19	19
Labor: Operation	32	5	37
Economic	5	29	34
Class: Upper	9	55	64
Lower	14	32	46
Party	13	41	54

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

If the novels which were taken as the basis for this study are typical of those written in Great Britain during the years from 1940 to 1949, inclusive, the foregoing discussion provides a basis for the belief that the contemporary British novel reflects with considerable accuracy the rise of socialism in Britain during World War II and the post-war period.

All of the novels studied reflect socialist ideas, either favorably or antagonistically, in regard to wealth, labor and class concepts. In the large use of Marxian language symbols, even in novels which seemingly oppose socialism, there is at least an inference that many of these influences have come from Marxism. In some of the novels in which socialism is argued against, socialist ideas are used favorably. This phenomenon can be seen, for example, in the novel by Huxley used in this investigation.

Concomitant with this is evidence that those novels written after 1945, the year in which the socialists gained power in Britain, show a more marked tendency to embody socialist ideas than those written before that year. This is best

exemplified in the novels by Hutchinson and Waugh which were studied. The later novels by each author used socialist ideas more frequently than did the earlier works. And in both cases there were fewer occurrences of Marxian class symbols in the earlier novels than in the later ones.

Feelings of insecurity and uncertainty, common ones in this decade, are reflected in the novels in the extent of the employment of the desire for security as a motivation for character behavior. It is significant, as an expression of the times, that the desire to be secure from war and its effects is given much attention along with the motives of desire for psychological and economic security. Considerable emphasis is placed upon the superiority of spiritual or metaphysical values over materialistic values in the novels which use the desire for psychological security as a motivating factor. This seems to indicate some renunciation of materialism and materialistic ideas, such as socialism, and a return to orthodox religion in order to escape the reality of the tensions in contemporary civilization.

Of the greatest significance is the fact that in these novels there appears an acceptance of ideas, particularly ideas of labor, class and party, as normal and ordinary which, in earlier generations, would have been considered radical or, at the minimum, unusually liberal. The final indication of socialist influence is the fact that departures from these ideas in the novels are not considered as radical, but as reactionary.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Novels

Bowen, Elizabeth. The Heat of the Day. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949.

Bridge, Ann. Singing Waters. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1946.

Greene, Graham. The Power and the Glory. New York: The Viking Press, 1940.

Hutchinson, R. C. Elephant and Castle. New York: Rinehart and Co., 1949.

--------. The Fire and the Wood. New York: The Literary Guild of America, Inc., 1940.

Huxley, Aldous. Ape and Essence. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.

Maugham, W. Somerset. The Razor's Edge. Pocket Book Edition. New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1946.

Priestley, J. B. Three Men in New Suits. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1945.

Waugh, Evelyn. Brideshead Revisited. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1946.

--------. Scott-King's Modern Europe. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1949.

Primary Sources on Socialism

A Handbook of Marxism. Edited by Emile Burns. New York: Random House, 1935.

Cole, G. D. H. Russia, Europe and the Future. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1942.

Hearnshaw, Fossey J. C. Democracy and Labour. London: The Macmillan Co., 1924.

Laski, Harold J. Democracy in Crisis. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1935.

--------. Where Do We Go From Here? New York: The Viking Press, 1940.

Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. The Communist Manifesto. Edited by Arnold Petersen. New York: The New York Labor News Co., 1948.

Shaw, Bernard. The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism. New York: Brentano's, 1928.

Strachey, John. Socialism Looks Forward. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1945.

--------. What Are We To Do? New York: Random House, 1938.

Wallas, Graham. Human Nature in Politics. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916.

--------. The Great Society. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1917.

Webb, Sidney and Beatrice. The Decay of Capitalist Civilization. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1923.

Wells, H. G. New Worlds for Old. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1908.

Secondary Sources on Socialism

Blake, William J. Elements of Marxian Economic Theory and its Criticism. New York: The Cordon Co., 1939.

De Man, Henry. The Psychology of Socialism. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1927.

Gray, Alexander. The Socialist Tradition. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1946.

Hutt, Allen. The Post-War History of the British Working Class. New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1938.

Kirkup, Thomas. A History of Socialism. 5th ed. revised by E. R. Pease. London: Black, 1920.

Laidler, H. W. A History of Socialist Thought. New York: Crowell, 1927.

Loucks, William and Hoot, J. Weldon. Comparative Economics. 3d ed. revised. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.

McEntee, Georgiana Putnam. The Social Catholic Movement in Great Britain. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927.

Venable, Vernon. Human Nature: The Marxian View. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1946.

Criticisms

Daiches, David. The Novel and the Modern World. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Forms of Modern Fiction. Edited by William Van O'Connor. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1948.

Articles

Crowther, Geoffrey. "British Socialism on Trial," The Atlantic Monthly, CLXXXIII (May 1949), pp. 24-30.

Churchill, R. C. "Literature or Propaganda? -- A Survey of the Marxist Thirties," The Nineteenth Century and After, CXXXIV (November 1943), pp. 227-37.

--------. "The Rural Novel in England," Spectator, CLXIX (October 22, 1943), p. 381.

Grigson, Geoffrey. "English Letter," The Sewanee Review, LIV (April 1946), pp. 308-15.

Orwell, George. "English Writing in Total War," The New Republic, CV (July 14, 1941), pp. 57-8.

Savage, D. S. "The Literary Situation in England," The Sewanee Review, LIII (October 1945), pp. 654-8.

Smith, Harrison. "The Literature of Transition," The Saturday Review of Literature, XXIV (July 26, 1941), p. 10.

Warner, Rex. "The State of Tomorrow," The Saturday Review of Literature, XXX (August 23, 1947), pp. 7-8.

Withington, Robert. "Art and Propaganda," School and Society, LXVI (July 22, 1947), pp. 17-20.